

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THREE articles in appreciation of W. T. STEAD are published in the May number of *The Contemporary Review*. One is written by Mrs. FAWCETT, one by Professor SCOTT HOLLAND, and one by Mr. E. T. COOK.

Professor SCOTT HOLLAND says: 'He was a most lovable man. He had something of the child about him, which drew and endeared. I recall the old days of Bulgarian atrocities, in which he and Liddon struck up their surprising friendship. I think of his confiding to Liddon, on a drive to Dunkeld, that he had learned more from John Knox than he had ever got out of St. Paul. "Indeed, dear friend; that, I confess, has not been my own experience," came the answer, in Liddon's softest tones.'

Mr. COOK, among other things, says: 'As I close these remarks, a letter reaches me, in which a friend of his recites a recent conversation. "When my work is done," he said, "I shall die a violent death." "How do you know?" "I cannot tell; but I have had a vision, and I know that it will be true, as surely as that I am talking to you." It is unlikely that we shall ever be told how he died; but those who knew him will be in no doubt. He must have faced his doom unflinchingly; for he knew no fear, and he did not believe that death meant separation. And, if

occasion arose, he must have comforted and strengthened any weaker brother within his reach. It was what he was doing all his life.'

From Mrs. FAWCETT's article we wish to quote several paragraphs. But let one paragraph precede them. It is from the *Life of Cardinal Manning* (vol. ii. p. 653): 'It is with diffidence and shrinking of heart that I venture, as I needs must, to touch upon an episode in Cardinal Manning's life which every man of right mind cannot but recall with infinite regret. Himself of stainless purity of life and thought, it never entered into his imagination to conceive the grossness of the methods pursued, under the pretext of purging the streets of London and its sin-spots from their moral foulness and impurities, by a pseudo-apostle of purity. Even good motives do not suffice to atone for methods so atrocious. Deluded, deceived by a sensational journalist's gross imaginings; accepting as true, horrid and harrowing tales of lust and cruelty which turned out in the main to be the product of a foul imagination running riot, Cardinal Manning gave his countenance and confidence to a man, whose name shall not defile even this unhappy page in the life of an austere and holy prelate. Even after the offender against the law of man as well as against the Divine Law was condemned to purge his rank offence in gaol, Cardinal Manning, in his strange infatuation, kept

up communication and correspondence with the evil-doer, still regarded him as a martyr to the cause of public purity.'

Now for Mrs. FAWCETT—and we shall not weaken her words by a syllable of comment: 'All who care for justice to women and who desire to see the law and its administration make sure that, as far as possible, the world shall be a place of happiness and safety for children, have lost a stalwart friend in the death of W. T. STEAD, who went down, on April 15th, with the *Titanic*.'

'I first became aware of a new note in journalism—at any rate in London journalism—in the early 'eighties. Here was some one writing with a pen touched with fire about the things that really mattered—clean living, and the protection of children from the deepest of wrongs; and the pen did not give the impression of being guided by sentimentalism; it was evidently wielded by a man who had made a careful study of facts, and was prepared to give battle to defend the right. I do not think I ever heard his name till everybody heard it in 1885, when all London—and, indeed, all the world—rang with the shameless and cruel traffic for immoral purposes in little children, exposed for the first time in the *Pall Mall Gazette*.

'This traffic could have been, and ought to have been, stopped by law; but the Bill dealing adequately with these horrors, though it had been passed more than once through the House of Lords, had been, session after session, talked out, counted out, and blocked in the House of Commons. It was counted out no more after Mr. STEAD had carried out his plan of insisting that all the world should know that these devilish things were of common everyday occurrence in a so-called Christian country. When he undertook his chivalric campaign, the age of consent in Christian England was thirteen; little children of thirteen could therefore legally consent to their own ruin, and no legal redress could be obtained from those who were worse than murderers. Many other

offences of the deepest villainy were unrecognized as such by the law, and therefore were liable to no legal punishment.

'All this was changed by the action which Mr. STEAD took. He was blamed for his sensationalism, for his want of good taste. But he knew what he was doing, and his training as a journalist told him that in order to rouse the torpid conscience of the House of Commons, shock tactics were necessary. I remember well his personal description of how he had been worked up to take the action which he did take. As a young man he had been greatly influenced by Mrs. Josephine Butler and her great crusade against the immoral Contagious Diseases Acts.

'It was Mrs. Josephine Butler who came to him with her heart-rending story, drawn from facts in her own experience, of the sale and purchase of young children in London for the purposes of immorality. Stead felt her message as a call for personal service. "Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient unto the Heavenly vision," he might have said—the Heavenly vision of trying to get God's will done on earth as it is in Heaven. But though he was full of the spirit which leads to personal service, he was careful and cautious in regard to facts. He felt he must make the groundwork of positive knowledge firm beneath his feet. He went, therefore, with his story, Mrs. Butler's story, to Sir Howard Vincent, then Head of the Criminal Investigation Department. "Just tell me," he said, "are such things possible?" The reply was: "They are not only possible, they are of common occurrence." Stead broke in, "It ought to rouse hell!" and Sir Howard rejoined, "It does not even rouse the neighbours."

'Stead determined it should rouse the neighbours and the whole country, and through them the miserable indifference of the House of Commons to villainy which was contaminating the life-blood of the nation at its source. He made a plan for the fictitious, but apparently real, sale of a child,

safeguarding himself and her at every stage by the presence of trustworthy witnesses of his *bona fides*. He also took into his confidence beforehand the Archbishop of Canterbury, Cardinal Manning, and other high ecclesiastics. He then spread broadcast in the columns of the *Pall Mall Gazette*, of which he was the Editor, the whole story. He accomplished what he set out to accomplish. The House of Commons boggled no more over the Criminal Law Amendment Bill; there were no more counts out and talks out of that long-delayed measure. The sons of Belial did what they could in the House to minimize its stringency, but they were no longer masters of the situation, and the Act which was finally passed was an enormous improvement on anything which up to that time had found a place in the Statute Book.

‘The enemy furiously raged together, and going over the whole of STEAD’S story told by himself with the utmost circumstance and publicity, discovered a joint in his armour of precautions, and that he had actually, in his crusade, committed a technical breach of the law. A grateful country sentenced him to three months’ imprisonment as an ordinary criminal. But he was almost immediately made a first-class misdemeanant, and went on editing the *Pall Mall Gazette* from his cell in Holloway.

‘It is pleasant to read’—thus Mrs. FAWCETT ends her article—‘it is pleasant to read what every one is saying of him now; that to him death was but the passage from one room to another of his Father’s house; that it was quite certain that he would be among the last to leave the ship, that among the tragic uncertainties of this tragic event there was, at any rate, one positive certainty, and that was that he would never seek his own safety at the cost of others, but would die, as he had lived, heroically. No one pretends that he was faultless; but he had a great and generous heart, a boundless and intense vitality, and the spontaneous desire everywhere and always to protect

and cherish the weak. We may be thankful for his life. “We are a nation yet,” as long as we can breed such men as he was.’

A volume of *Studies in the Development of Judaism and Early Christianity* has been published by Mr. Edward Arnold, under the title of *The Parting of the Roads* (10s. 6d. net). The volume has been edited by Dr. F. J. FOAKES JACKSON, Fellow and Dean of Jesus College, Cambridge; and the essays it contains have all been written by members of the same College. It is therefore a witness to the important place that the study of theology still retains in a Cambridge College. It is at the same time an agreeable testimony to the vitality of the teaching and influence of its Dean.

The Introduction has been written by the Dean of St. Paul’s, and it is of the Introduction that we have something to say. But as these notes must serve for a review of the book, let us glance at the other essays first and at least give their titles and their authors’ names.

Dr. FOAKES JACKSON himself tells the fascinating story of ‘How the Old Testament came into Being.’ The essay is not a mere re-statement of the results of recent Old Testament criticism. There are elements in it that are new, and some that may be disputed. ‘That Abraham was originally a native of Ur Chasdim (Ur of the Chaldees) may well be a historical fact; but at the same time the prominence given to the circumstances that he left the country never to return, and that this was the proof of his obedience to the Divine call, suggests that, when the prelude to the Law was compiled, the ancestral home of the patriarch was the centre of idolatry, which he forsook because the true God could not rightly be served there. The way in which Abraham enjoined his servant Eliezer never to permit his son to go back to Mesopotamia, lends additional plausibility to this theory. I am disposed, there-

fore, to believe that the compilation of the Book of Genesis is part of the great polemic against idolatry, which resulted in the promulgation of the Priestly Law.'

The Third essay (for Dr. INGE's Introduction is reckoned as one) has been written by the Chaplain of the College, the Rev. Richard Thomas HOWARD, M.A. Its subject is 'The Devotional Value of the Old Testament.' This is another and better way of asking, What is the authority which after criticism the Old Testament carries? The conclusion which Mr. HOWARD comes to is that in the ordinary sense of the word the Old Testament carries no authority whatever. And if you ask him what is the use of it then, he answers that there are six most precious uses to which it may be put. We may learn the nature of God from it; we may by the reading of it appropriate to ourselves the religious experience of the saints; we may be brought by it into communion with God; it may serve as a practical guide to life and morals; it may be of use for the instruction of children and the ignorant; and it may even lead men to Christ—though rarely,—or at least—and this quite commonly—it may teach men to know Christ better.

The title of the fourth essay is 'Judaism in the Days of the Christ.' Its author is Dr. W. O. E. OESTERLEY, who starts at once by showing us that the Judaism into which our Lord was born was definitely marked by two tendencies, one Palestinian, the other Hellenistic. 'Palestinian Judaism was a religion of law; Hellenistic Judaism was a religion of hope. Both tendencies are apparent in the Gospels. Christ accepted the law as a whole, although He was occasionally critical towards it and sometimes directly antagonistic. The religion of hope, which found its outward expression in the Apocalyptic literature, was adopted by Christ as the basis of His teaching. At the present time it is to this religion of hope in the Gospels, or what is called their Eschatology, that attention is almost entirely directed. Its difficulties are very great. Dr. OESTERLEY does not think that we can remove

them without further light. But he seems to be convinced that we are not bound to admit that Christ was mistaken in His thoughts about the future. It is better to say that our witnesses misunderstood and misrepresented Him.

Perhaps the most difficult of all the essays, and perhaps the most successful, is the fifth, written by Mr. H. G. WOOD, M.A. For Mr. WOOD's title is 'Some Characteristics of the Synoptic Writers.' And the difficulty with such a subject is simply to say anything that has not been well said already. It is, however, necessary that we should hear the latest word even on a well-worked theme; and Mr. WOOD has the additional interest of a phraseology that clings. He speaks of the 'pessimistic Judaism' of St. Matthew, and the 'sanguine Universalism' of St. Luke.

The Rev. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE, M.A., writes the sixth essay on 'St. Peter and the Twelve.' The title is not to be taken as if the discovery had been made that St. Peter was not one of the Twelve. Nor is Mr. CLARKE a Roman Catholic to separate St. Peter from the rest of the Apostles and compel them to do obeisance after the manner of Joseph and his brethren. When he says St. Peter and the Twelve he simply means that he is going to write the history of the Twelve, and especially the history of St. Peter.

Four essays remain. It is enough to name them. Mr. George Bertram REDMAN, B.A., writes on 'The Theology of St. Paul'; Mr. Bertram Tom Dean SMITH, M.A., on 'The Johannine Theology'; Mr. Ephraim LEVINE, B.A., on 'The Breach between Judaism and Christianity'; and Mr. Percival Gardner SMITH, B.A., on 'Revelation.'

A word on Mr. LEVINE's essay. Mr. LEVINE is a Jew. The editor tells us that he is an orthodox Jew and seems drawn towards the ministry of the Synagogue. His contribution to *The Parting of the Roads*, says Dr. FOAKES

JACKSON, 'is valuable as giving us a Jewish view of the matter.'

Mr. LEVINE's contribution is certainly brimful of interest. In dealing with the breach between Judaism and Christianity, a Jew of the present day is pretty sure to resent the picture of the Pharisees presented in the Gospels. But Mr. LEVINE is not unreasonably resentful. 'The Pharisees,' he says, 'whose purpose and aims have, I venture to think, been entirely misrepresented by many, were engaged in the further development of the faith of Israel. The Gospel statements and the evidence of the sources do not justify the condemnation of a body of God-fearing men for the misconceptions of individuals. Pharisee ought never to be used as synonymous with hypocrite.'

But Mr. LEVINE passes to much more doubtful ground than this. He declares emphatically that the death of Jesus was due to the Romans, and that the Jews had nothing to do with it. Perhaps it is not out of place to assure him that Englishmen have no desire now, however it may have been in the past, to lay the burden of this great guilt upon the Jews. They would rejoice unfeignedly if he could prove that the Jews never said, 'His blood be on us and on our children.' But it is not possible to accept his arguments as sufficient. There are many objections, he says, to any attribution of the death of Jesus to the Jews, but he names only three. First, there is the objection that crucifixion was not a Jewish but a Roman mode of execution; second, that a threefold execution at one time is doubtful; and third, that an execution on the Friday or on the day before Passover would be most unlikely. That is all, and in the face of the testimony of the Gospels, that is not enough to make out even a good case for investigation.

Now let us return to the introductory essay. It is written, as we have said, by the Rev. WILLIAM RALPH INGE, D.D., Dean of St. Paul's and Hon.

Fellow of Jesus College. It has no title, for the same reason, we suppose, as John Wesley's parish had no name. Its subject is Christianity. But a volume of University essays must not be too discursive, nor must it say over again, however cleverly, what has been said before. It must mark progress, and it must make it. Dr. INGE recognizes the obligation.

Its subject is Christianity, and the first question is, Where did Christianity come from? The ordinary answer is that it came out of Judaism. Dr. INGE at once denies the sufficiency of that answer, and even seems to deny that there is anything in it. Christianity could not have come out of Judaism, for the simple reason 'that the cradle of our faith was not Judæa but Galilee, and that the Galileans had probably hardly a drop of Jewish blood in their veins.'

But there is another reason why Christianity could not have sprung from Judaism. Christianity is a religion, Judaism is not. What does he say? Judaism is not a religion? He says so. He knows how often it has been asserted that the Jews had a unique genius for religion, but he does not believe a word of it. There was one thing that they had a unique genius for: that thing was patriotism. 'Fanatical, indeed almost insane, patriotism was the dominant passion of the average Jew.' And so when the ancient Hebrews adopted Jehovah as their God, they fiercely declared that He was the only real God upon earth, simply because, as in the words of Philo, the Jew was the only real man. It was their patriotism, therefore, says the Dean of St. Paul's, that led the Jews into monotheism. For it was their patriotism that gave them any religion they ever had. With them patriotism and religion were in truth indistinguishable. And so whatever blessing they looked for in the future, it was always a blessing upon earth, not in heaven. There might be something of an ideal in it—the future must always be more or less idealistic—but whatever the future should bring forth to the Jews,

it must be recognized as among the good things of this present material world.

But surely the Jews had some consciousness of sin, and where there is consciousness of sin, how can there fail to be real religion? Dr. INGE does not believe that their consciousness of sin was of much account. 'As a learned Jew once told me, persons of his faith are never encouraged to "worry about their sins" (in Sir Oliver Lodge's phrase); with them the one and only requisite is to "turn to the Lord." In other words, conversion of the will is enough; by-gones may be by-gones.' And even their consciousness of sin, he says, was usually awakened by national calamity. When the political horizon was bright their conscience was at rest. When the political horizon looked very black indeed, it behoved every patriotic Jew to omit no precaution, no minutest detail of pious observance, if so be that the wrath of God might be turned away. And thus it came to pass that the religion of the Jews was not only confined to this world, but was also limited to legal observance.

Where, then, did Christianity come from? There is another possible source. It is the religion of the Greeks. Were the Greeks more religious than the Jews? Dean INGE seems to think that they were, and yet he does not deny the truth of the current conception of Greek religion. The contrast, he says, between the Hellenic and Hebraic views of life has been drawn out by many since Matthew Arnold. 'The difference is indeed striking between the narrow and fierce absorption of the Jew in the fortunes of his nation, his indifference to all but concrete tangible marks of Divine favour, his intense will-power and defective æsthetic sensibility, and (on the other side) the genial, open-minded mentality of the Greek, full of curiosity and enjoyment of nature, an artist to his finger-tips, as the Japanese, and no other nation, are to-day; whose religion was a poetical and symbolical mythology; who lived in a present which he loved to enjoy and

ardently desired to understand; who, like a child, craved only to *see* all that is to be seen of this wonderful world and the spiritual mysteries which may lie behind it; whose intellect was so much more developed than his will, that he sincerely believed that to see the truth was to possess it, vice being only ignorance and virtue knowledge; and whose sense of the finer values of life was so keen that he frankly despised unnecessary apparatus, and lived a hardier and healthier life than any civilized race has lived before or since.'

Is this the religion that is the true ancestor of Christianity? No, this is not the religion, and these are not the Greeks. Of these Greeks, the classical Greeks as we call them, few, if any, were left in the time of Christ. The race was all but extinct. It had been swamped in the mongrel horde with which the Roman Empire was filling its Eastern provinces. But as the ancient Greek race died it gave birth to Hellenism. As the classical Greek age passed away, the Hellenistic age came into existence; and when Dr. Inge says that Christianity owes more to the Greeks than to the Jews, he means that it owes more to the Hellenists than to the Hebrews.

For the paradise of the Hebrew was on earth; the paradise of the Hellenist was in heaven: and Christianity preferred the paradise of the Hellenist. The Greek conception of religion, at least in its later form, was a complex of three parts—ritualism, ethics, and mysticism—and Christianity accepted that complex. The Greek (by which he always means now the Hellenist) possessed a symbolical mythology. He possessed also a philosophy which tended more and more to become a strict ethical and devotional discipline, conducting the soul through purification to illumination, and through illumination to the beatific vision of God. Christianity took over both the mythology and the philosophy.

But now Dr. Inge seems to repent a little. He seems to fear that he has taken too much from

the Jew, and given too much to the Greek. Before the essay closes he brings the two races together. He places their religious peculiarities side by side. On the one side stands the Hebrew with his inveterate habit of forcing all ideas into the form of time. On the other side stands the Hellenist whose ideal world was exalted above time. How different, he says, from the Greek mysteries, with their promise of a blessed immortality to the initiated, is the Jewish dream of universal sovereignty over a transfigured earth, with Jerusalem as the world's capital. He now bids us consider these two racial types, utterly unlike each other, as they stand confronted—on the one side, 'Thy sons, O Zion,' on the other, 'Thy sons, O Greece.' And what he sees in the end is these two uniting and begetting 'that strangest product of time,' Catholic Christianity.

And he concludes by asking how it is possible for fire and water thus to coalesce. 'The deepest and truest answer is surely this, that the Divine Founder of Christianity was above the antithesis.' In Christ there is *both Jew and Greek*.

The question of miracles is always with us. Men grow impatient regarding it, but they cannot get rid of it. There is no denying, and there is no longer any possibility of ignoring, the fact that it is simply the miracles that make the difference between the believer in Christ and the unbeliever. The one asserts that not to believe in the resurrection of Christ from the dead is not to believe in Christ. The other answers that resurrection from the dead is a physical impossibility. Thus the gulf is fixed, and no one seems able to discover a way of bridging it.

The Rev. J. H. SKRINE has discovered a way. He has been driven to a reconsideration of the subject of miracle 'through the occurrence recently of a practical incident' in the Church of England. The reference, no doubt, is to the startling outcome of the Rev. J. H. THOMPSON'S book on *Miracles in the New Testament*. He

starts with the word miracle itself. Antagonists, he says, in order to find a common resting-ground, have resorted to the dictionary. He resorts to the dictionary also. But he does not open the English dictionary. He does not transcribe the ordinary English definition, that a miracle is an occurrence which is not in agreement with the known laws of nature. He opens a Latin dictionary, 'the more elementary the better.' He opens at the word *miraculum*. He finds that *miraculum* is defined as a thing which makes us wonder. That definition of miracle he accepts.

A miracle is a thing which makes us wonder. But what is wonder? It is not the same as surprise. An object that is simply new may excite surprise. A horse which shies at meeting a novel instrument of transport has an emotion of surprise; for animals are as susceptible to surprise as men. But the Chinaman who met the first railway engine in China experienced more than surprise. He experienced wonder; because the thing which he met was mightier than man and all his works. His wonder was a movement of the whole man in response to the stimulus of a thing too great for him. His mind recognized something beyond its compass, his heart felt the throb of fear, his will addressed itself for self-protection.

Now when a Christian receives on his soul the effect of miracle, his feeling is a feeling of wonder. And this wonder is the response of his whole nature to the stimulus of the new, which is greater than he is. It stimulates his thought, and he answers as did the subject of the first Christian miracle, 'How shall this be?' It stimulates his emotions. He seeks to 'love the appearing' of the Divine One who is the agent. It stimulates his will, and he utters the 'Be it unto me according to thy word.' Thus to believe a miracle is to respond to the wonder of it with the whole personality.

Here, then, is the critical moment in the problem of the miraculous. The wonder is before our

eyes—the wonder of the Virgin Birth, or the wonder of the rising from the dead. What response do we make to it? If we repel it, we determine to remain impervious to the intrusion of that which is greater than nature; we refuse communion with the Divine. But if we welcome it, the movement of wonder ends in an act of self-surrender, self-surrender to the new-found greatness in the world which encompasses the soul—and wonder has passed into Faith.

Now as wonder is greater than surprise, so faith is greater than wonder. For wonder may dwindle into incuriousness, it may smoulder to extinction; but, on the other hand, it may grow into conviction, it may flame into life. Then faith comes, and faith remains. And thus faith and unfaith are the respective issues of a miracle, the alternatives of response or refusal of response to the stimulus of a fact which presents itself as the wonderful. Mr. SKRINE claims that this account of the function of miracle in religion differs essentially from the account usually given, that miracle causes belief by operating a breach of natural law and thereby giving evidence that the greater than law is here. 'Our account,' he says, 'differs from this, not by contradicting but by comprehending it; differs from it as the whole differs from a part. We say that miracle proves truth, not by imparting knowledge to the understanding, but by pricking the personality into life.'

Mr. SKRINE then applies this function of miracle to the two most momentous miracles of the New Testament—the Incarnation (or more particularly the Virgin Birth) of our Lord, and His Resurrection from the dead. Accordingly, while the title of his book is *Miracle and History*, the sub-title is 'A Study of the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection' (Longmans; 1s. net).

On both miracles Mr. SKRINE has something new to say. Take the Incarnation first. He finds that the word Incarnation is almost invariably used as if it were another name for the Nativity. The

Incarnation is supposed to have taken place when Mary gave birth to her Babe, or rather, when she accepted at the Annunciation the action on her of the 'power of the Highest.' But the word has another meaning than that. That is the historic Incarnation. There is also, however, an Incarnation which is timeless. There is a current of Divine action which is always passing along the plane of human existence, and always making for the reconciliation of God and man. Just as in the inanimate world we have the law of Gravitation, and in the animate world the law of Evolution, so in the world of personal existence we have the law of Incarnation.

Now when the Incarnation of the Son of God took place, by His birth of the Virgin Mary, there took place simply one act of that law of Incarnation which is perpetually going on in the world, just as the falling of an apple is one act of the law of gravitation. And so just as the falling of an apple does not contradict but exemplifies the law of gravitation, and therefore is no miracle in the usual English-dictionary meaning of that word, so the Incarnation of Christ is no miracle in that sense. But in the other sense it is a miracle indeed. For it is a cause of unceasing wonder. And through the sense of wonder it works upon the human personality, upon the thoughts, the emotions, and the will of man, until he surrenders to the almightiness of it and responds with saving Faith.

Mr. SKRINE does not mean that every single act of incarnation, that is to say, of reconciliation between God and man, of entrance of God into the life of man and of man into the life of God, must have this result. The wonder of this act is in the greatness of it. And the greatness of it is due to the greatness of Him who became incarnate. In what does His greatness consist?

It consists in this, that while He is a man, He is not any man, but all of Man. Mr. SKRINE does not mean that Jesus exhibited all the varieties of

human character and fortune in His one brief existence. He was not all men in that sense. But He was all manhood in the sense of being in His life's action that which humanity in its essence and perfection is. For in its essence and perfection humanity is the creature of God, realizing wholly the Creator's will, and becoming the thing which God meant when He said, 'Let there be man.' And this is the person that the Christian believes Jesus to have been.

Jesus became what the Creator meant when He said, 'Let us make man,' simply because He realized to the full the Creator's will. And how did He realize it? He realized it by making His life an unreserved sacrifice of self to the Father and to His fellow-men in the Father's name. In His action and in His suffering, from the cradle to the grave, not His will but God's was done. And this sacrifice was a sacrifice which God accepted. That also must be added. In Mr. SKRINE's words, 'The fire of the Lord fell, and answered the sacrificer's gift by a gift of the Eternal's Self.' Jesus was declared the Son of God with power by the resurrection from the dead. This is the object of wonder that ends in Faith. This is the Incarnation that is unique. The Son gave Himself to the Father in the fullness of self-surrender; the Father gave Himself to the Son in the fullness of loving communion.

And now we see the place and necessity of the Jesus of history. Incarnation, which is an eternal principle, is seen on the stage of history in Jesus Christ. Timeless, it enters into time in the Babe found in a manger. We are assured of the principle, when we look upon the fact. The law of gravitation was in existence before Newton saw the apple fall. The fall of the apple gave him experimental assurance of it. The Virgin Birth is no longer a miracle in the old sense of that word, but in the new sense of the word it is a miracle that leads to God.

The second great miracle in Christianity is the

Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. Mr. SKRINE, if we follow him, has already made the way open to an understanding of it. The Resurrection is part of the Incarnation. It is a phase, it is a moment, of that whole Divine action. Mr. SKRINE even places the Resurrection over against the Incarnation as if he held that it also was a timeless principle, the reality of which has been revealed in time by the great act of the Resurrection of Jesus from the dead. 'As there was a universal, spiritual, mystical Incarnation,' he says, 'a force by which God for ever and everywhere is drawing His creature Man into union with Himself, while there was also a particular historic Incarnation, an exhibition of that time-long, world-wide force in the actual union of the Divine nature with the human nature of one man Jesus—so is there a spiritual or eternal Resurrection, a force in things by which self-sacrifice causes Soul to live beyond the physical incident called death, and there is also a temporal historic Resurrection, an exhibition of that force once in time through the spectacle of what befell the soul of Jesus who by self-sacrifice lived through death, suffered as behoved the Christ, and entered into His glory.'

The tenet of an ideal or universal Resurrection is not a tenet of Christians only, any more than the tenet of an ideal Incarnation is exclusively theirs. What is specifically Christian is the historic survival of Jesus. It is the fact and not the law that is ours; not the reality of Incarnation or of Resurrection, but their assurance. 'We are not sure of the law that sacrifice makes life until we see it realized in the objective world. It was so realized when one man who was All of Man, did by His sacrifice live on through body's death. Then we learnt that the Spirit of Sacrifice, of which our simpler name is Love, not only is "Lord of All," but this one time was Lord in this one thing of All, the soul of Jesus and His fate. Love whom we had guessed to be strong as death was in a visible trial of strength proved stronger. Christ had loved utterly even unto death, and behold He is alive for evermore.'

Professor Hogg on the Kingdom of God.

BY EUGENE STOCK, D.C.L., LONDON.

IN the February number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, a certain 'insignificant-looking book' was pronounced to be 'the most valuable book of the season.' This was *Christ's Message of the Kingdom*, by Professor A. G. Hogg of the Madras Christian College. Of that little book I have made a rather careful study, and with the editor's permission I attempt in the present paper a simple account of its contents, without comment of my own. Whatever may be thought of Mr. Hogg's argument, it at least calls for the consideration of Biblical and theological students; and I hope that this slight sketch may serve to introduce it to not a few readers.

The form of the work is notable, and is not at first sight favourable to a just estimate of its importance. It is described on the title-page as 'A Course of Daily Study for Private Students and for Bible Circles'; and it consists of ninety short studies—some very short (even less than a page)—that is, readings for fifteen weeks of six days each; the seventh day in each week being devoted to questions suggested by the six days' study. It is quite a novelty to find a serious theological treatise presented in such a form as this; but the author states that he has done so, not only to render the book suitable for Bible Circles, but also to help the reader to study it in a devotional spirit, carefully comparing the Scripture passages indicated, and not hurrying on with mere speculative inquiries. The Scripture references, which are given at the head of each day's study, are quite extraordinarily apposite; and it is absolutely essential to a true understanding of the book that the reader should not trust to his knowledge, however accurate, of chapter and verse, but should conscientiously look out and read every single text or passage, however familiar. Again and again one is struck by something in them of which one had only partially seen the point, or even not seen it at all.

The main purpose of the book is to answer the question, What was Christ's Message of the Kingdom? He preached 'the Gospel of the Kingdom'; He said, 'the Kingdom is at hand'; more than that, 'The Kingdom is come' (Mt 12²⁸, Lk 11²⁰; cf. Lk 17²¹ R.V. margin). The ex-

pression, let me add, occurs in His recorded words 50 times in St. Matthew, 16 times in St. Mark, 35 times in St. Luke, 4 times in St. John. I do not here distinguish between the 'Kingdom of God' and the 'Kingdom of heaven'; but of course Professor Hogg does not ignore the difference. The point is, what did our Lord mean by the phrase, 'the Kingdom is at hand'?

The answer to the question, as given in this book, may be thus stated: (1) In a much more important sense than we generally realize, the Kingdom did actually come as 'a new world-order' in our Lord's day; (2) there was no reason why its consummation should not then have come in the fullest sense, except the sin and unbelief of man; (3) there is no reason, except our unbelief, why we should not be living and acting now under the new world-order which is already present, including the use of the divine power already at the disposal of faith for working what are called miracles; (4) there is no reason, except our own unreadiness, why the full consummation of the Kingdom should not come now, there being no fixed date, near or distant, for that consummation.

It is an illustration of Professor Hogg's spiritual method that the book begins with a whole week of personal application. The opening sentence is characteristic: 'St. Paul could not keep silent.' This alludes to one of the texts referred to just above, Ro 1¹⁴, 'I am debtor. . . .' Then, 'He felt himself under obligation to give freely as he had freely received—to tell to any one who would listen of that wondrous new life in Christ into which he had entered, and which had transformed for him the face of the world.' Then, 'The world misunderstands and misjudges the Father. Can His children keep silence?' Various doubts are then noticed, doubts about God meaning what He says,—not conscious or expressed doubts, but doubts evidenced by our conduct. These are illustrated from the O.T. Gn 3 is referred to ('Yea, hath God said?'); and the 88th Psalm as a picture of utter darkness; and various complaints in other Psalms.

The Second Week, which is entitled 'The

Vindication of Jehovah,' takes us again to the O.T., and refers us to various passages predicting the coming Kingdom or 'Messianic age,' which would be the vindication of God amid the perplexities and problems of life and death. Among the passages cited is the 74th Psalm, with its picture of disaster and distress, and in the very middle of it (v.¹²), 'Yet God is my King of old.' It is shown from the Psalms and Isaiah that the ideas of O.T. times about the coming Kingdom were progressively enlarging. At first, only national prosperity; then a restoration of Eden, and the abolition of sin and death; then, in view of the natural question, But what about those already dead? hints (Is 27, Dn 12) of a future resurrection. Dn 7 is cited as showing that the expected Kingdom was no mere earthly development, but was to be supernatural: 'The man-like figure "comes with the clouds of heaven."' "

Then, in the Third Week, comes the question, 'Why does it tarry?' which is the title of the Week's Study. The Book of Job is cited to show that one object of the delay may be the discipline or training of God's people. Another reason would be the need of atonement, as shown in Is 53. But coming to the New Testament, we find both John the Baptist and our Lord saying the Kingdom is 'at hand'; and an interesting study of their words is undertaken, to show that they referred to the same Kingdom, and to the same time of its coming. The teaching of the Week is thus summed up:—

'(1) By the coming of the Kingdom Christ meant the same event as the Apocalyptists meant, viz. the arrival of a new age, when God would at last let Himself act in the way in which faith had always felt it only natural that He should act, giving His omnipotence free play in the service of His righteousness,—an age in which therefore supernatural forces would be available for the conquest of suffering evil, and sin.'

'(2) He announced this Kingdom as close at hand—indeed in some respects (viz. in the availableness of supernatural forces) as already present. . . .

'(3) He described the present phase of the Kingdom as a process of gradual growth, but did not thereby exclude the present phase from terminating in a sudden crisis of fulfilment.'

And yet, 'it appears so obvious that the Kingdom had *not* yet arrived.' What, then, did Christ's Now mean? The answer is expressed in the title of the Fourth Week, 'It need not Tarry.' 'May the Kingdom not really have been at hand—not merely that beginning of it which actually came to pass, but its consummation too? May it not have been the incredible obstinacy of human distrust that needlessly prevented what might really have taken place?' God, in fact, was always ready, but man was not. But by the Incarnation a Man appeared whose perfect life and absolute trust in His Father introduced the new world-order.

At this point emerges one of the chief teachings of the book. The author takes a strong view of what is called the *kenosis*. He is an absolutely orthodox believer in the Deity of Christ. 'God the Son became Man'; 'He was Very God'; 'God Incarnate,'—these are among his emphatic statements on that fundamental doctrine. But he holds that God the Son 'emptied Himself' more completely at the Incarnation than the average Christian has been accustomed to think. He takes our Lord's words in their most literal sense; such words as 'I can of Mine own self do nothing,' 'The thing which I speak, even as the Father said unto Me, so I speak,' and other similar utterances. He particularly lays stress upon the mysterious words in Mk 13³² (also in the R.V. of Mt 24³⁶), 'Neither the Son.' He points out, indeed, that this very passage implies the Son's unique greatness. 'Of that day and hour knoweth (1) no one; (2) not even the angels in heaven; (3) neither the Son'—the Son standing alone. Yet he will not explain away the plain statement that Jesus *did not know*. And his belief evidently is that his view, so far from detracting from the unique greatness of the Son of God, enhances it by magnifying His condescension.

Relying on our Lord's words, Professor Hogg draws a remarkable picture of what may have been in His mind during His earthly life and ministry; dwelling, as so many modern writers do, but with a reverent devotion not too common among them, upon the gradually growing consciousness of Jesus of His divine mission. Mr. Hogg does not, as some do, defer all that sacred consciousness till the Baptism. He infers from the narrative of Jesus being found in the Temple that 'the uniquely intimate filial consciousness of God which He manifested throughout His public ministry went

back to His earliest years,' but thinks that it was the baptismal revelation that assured Him of His Messianic office. Then Mr. Hogg suggests that He 'hoped' and 'expected' the immediate, or at least speedy, consummation of the Kingdom. 'He knew that with the Father all things were possible—that nothing could be too glorious for God. Would He not then have been false to His Father if He had counted an early consummation unlikely? . . . Is it not we ourselves who blaspheme God when we assume that the end necessarily was and necessarily is far off?'

Professor Hogg urges that this 'adds to the story of the life of Christ an absorbing human interest.' 'It gives a new moving power to' certain passages 'by permitting us to interpret them in their natural sense as expressions of genuine disappointment.' For instance, the weeping over Jerusalem, 'If thou hadst known, even thou,' and the words, 'O Jerusalem . . . how often would I . . .'. How far more pathetic these words—such is Mr. Hogg's contention—if they express, not merely sorrow for a rejection which was always before Him as a matter of course, but grief for a sin which He had fondly hoped might have been averted; and how much deeper our sense of His love!

But if it be granted that the Lord might have so laid aside His divine knowledge as to be liable to such disappointment of genuine hopes, the question arises, why should He expect any other issue of His ministry?

First, because of 'the limitless power of God'; and, secondly, 'it was difficult for Him to believe that men could long remain deaf to such a wondrous message from the Father.' This is illustrated by a verse which Mr. Hogg twice puts at the head of the Daily Studies, Mk 6⁶, 'He marvelled because of their unbelief.' How could He 'marvel' if He knew it all beforehand? Even when He perceived the certainty of His rejection and death, that death, and the resurrection which was to follow, 'would surely give to the message an irresistible power,' and the consummation would quickly follow (cf. Jn 12²⁴, the 'corn of wheat' . . . bearing much fruit, and the declaration just after, 'I, if I be lifted up,' etc.). 'We may,' says Mr. Hogg, 'venture to suppose that our Lord began His public ministry with a solemn consciousness on the one hand that the establishment of the Kingdom *might* cost a criminal tragedy

like that foreshadowed in Is 53, but on the other hand with the great and glad hope (of which we seem to see the last flicker in the Gethsemane prayer) that the Father, with whom all things were possible, might . . . fulfil His gracious purpose toward mankind in some way less grievously tarnished by human sin and guilt.' 'Ought we not,' adds Mr. Hogg, 'to feel convicted of unbelief if we have at all felt that His hope was unwarrantable?' And he gives us for reference Mt 17²⁰, Mk 9²³ 10²⁷.

If, then, we may venture to think that Jesus did 'hope' or 'expect' a speedy consummation, then '*it really might have been fulfilled.*' 'Since we cannot ascribe any fickle wavering of purpose to God, it follows that if the date of the consummation was really uncertain, this must have been because God intended it to depend upon the attitude of man.' 'God will not bind Himself by any prediction as to the time of the consummation, but reserves to Himself full freedom (Ac 1⁷) to send it *whenever* He sees that human conditions are ripe for it (Mk 4²⁹).'

Therefore, the answer to the question, Why did the Kingdom tarry? and why does it tarry now? is, *It need not have tarried then, and it need not tarry now.*

Then follow Studies for two weeks, entitled 'The Kingdom as Present' and 'The Kingdom of Glory.' Under the former head the whole question of Miracles is discussed. 'For many N.T. scholars,' writes Mr. Hogg, 'the presumption that miracles do not happen has become a guiding principle of criticism. The Christian on the other hand should proceed on the assumption that unless the message of the Kingdom is a false message, miracles are to be expected.' Christ and the New Age had begun. How, then, would we expect Him to act? We should expect Him (1) to be 'content with ordinary agencies whenever these sufficed for His purposes, because the Messianic Age was not to be something absolutely different from all that had gone before, but was only to supplement and perfect it.' (2) But when ordinary agencies were not sufficient, He 'would freely draw upon the infinite resources of God.' (3) He would 'look upon the fact that supernatural (that is, unprecedented) agencies did actually operate at His desire as furnishing an irrefragable proof of the truth of His message.' (4) He 'would regard the use of these supernatural powers of the Messianic

age as no peculiar privilege of His own, but as open to all.' To illustrate this the Gospel narratives are examined; and I may perhaps condense the resulting conclusions as follows:—

(a) Our Lord often healed men without recourse to 'miracle.' The evidence from the Gospels for this statement is remarkable, and worth careful study. The conclusion is, 'Christ's ministry of healing was a work in which He used the curative applications of His day, drawing upon supernatural agencies only as a supplementary resource'; 'it therefore made heavy demands upon His time and physical strength'; 'He felt the need of constant prayer to keep Himself spiritually in tone for the acts of faith involved in His more striking cures' (Mk 9²⁹).

(b) The real 'miracles' were *not* 'a breach of order.' If a new supernatural order was present, 'it must manifest its presence in supernatural occurrences.'

(c) There was no limit to the possible use by Christ of supernatural powers. It was for seeing this that He praised the centurion; and Mt 26⁵³ shows His 'utterly unlimited claims . . . upon His Father's resources.'

(d) 'The miracles both of Christ and in the Early Church were an indispensably necessary evidence of the truth of the Gospel.'

(e) The account of our Lord's Temptation shows that 'miracles' are not to be wrought either for private ends or to convince sceptics. 'While He estimated very highly the evidential value of His miracles for those who had the rudiments of faith,' He knew that 'where this was absent miracles had no educative value (Lk 16³¹),' and indeed created excitement, distracting attention from His teaching. Hence His frequent injunctions to those who were healed not to tell others about it.

(f) A note here refers to other kinds of miracles, the water made wine, the stilling of the tempest, the walking on the sea, the draughts of fishes. 'All these,' says Mr. Hogg, 'are cases where a striking interference with the natural order is brought to pass, not for the sake of averting tragedy or curing grievous pain, but for ends which at first seem ordinary. Only a kingly soul could feel it natural to expend such resources on such objects. They impress us as regal acts.'

So much for our Lord's miracles. But Professor Hogg further contends that as we are living in the Messianic age under a new supernatural world-

order, Christ's words in Mt 17 and Mk 11 are literally true: 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove; and nothing shall be impossible unto you'; and 'Have faith in God. Verily I say unto you, Whosoever . . . shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass; he shall have it. . . . All things whatsoever,' etc. 'Miracles in the Christian sense,' he says, 'and prayer, are just the outer and inner aspects of the same fact—that the universe is not a fixed mechanical system, but a Messianic order in which the unlimited resources of God are freely available to us for all right ends.' How keen was Christ's disappointment at the disciples' failure at the foot of the mount of Transfiguration! 'With this cry ringing in our ears, let us look back over our own past efforts to benefit our fellow-men, and ask whether our lives have been a fulfilment of Jn 15¹⁶—"I chose you, and appointed you, that ye should go and bear fruit, and that your fruit should abide: that whatsoever ye shall ask of the Father in My Name, He may give it you."'

On the subject of 'the Kingdom of glory,' Professor Hogg says that if the Kingdom in its present phase is 'the dawning of a new world-order,' 'much more will the perfected phase include a transformation of the entire known universe.' He considers that our popular notions of 'heaven' have hindered us from perceiving this and much more. 'As the Kingdom is the perfecting of earth, with victory over all forces of evil, decay, and death, so life in the Kingdom is the perfecting of earthly life with immunity from sin and disease and death.' One passage I must quote in full:

'Let us recollect what the consummated Kingdom of God means. It means an order of things in which God will at last act in the way in which faith has always felt it only natural that He should act, letting His omnipotence have free play in the service of His goodness, for the perfecting of the world and the abolition of every curse.

'But if this be so, then obviously those who live in the consummated Kingdom will have an omnipotent bulwark against all forces of evil, including death. Life in the Kingdom will therefore be immortal. Its immortality will not be due to any inherent metaphysical

indestructibleness of the soul, but will be a consequence of the consummation of the Kingdom—a consequence accruing, therefore, only to those who are members of the Kingdom. Moreover, since the Kingdom means the perfecting of earth, life in the Kingdom must include the perfecting of our rich human life. In fact, the more truly precious any earthly relationship appears to us, the more confident may we be that this will be preserved and perfected in the eternal Kingdom. Is not this a satisfying gospel?

Then follow four weekly Studies, entitled 'The Reign of God,' 'Unworldliness and Other-Worldliness,' 'The Unworldly Life,' 'The Goal of Endeavour.' 'We pass,' says the author, 'from the question of what difference the establishment of the Kingdom makes *to* man, and begin to study the difference it makes *in* man.' Under the first head, 'The Reign of God,' he dwells on the character and conduct of the community of members of the Kingdom, expounding our Lord's teaching about 'meekness and humble service' being 'the only title to rank and authority,' about treatment of erring members and of wrong-doers who are outsiders, about 'rendering to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's,' etc. 'In any State the institutions of which do not perfectly conform to these principles, the sons of the kingdom must feel themselves not wholly citizens, but in some degree "strangers and pilgrims."'" A good deal in these Studies reminds one of *Ecce Homo*.

Turning from the community to the individual, Mr. Hogg next reviews Christ's attitude to external religious observances, asceticism, marriage and family life, social reform, the ethics of trade, property, etc. His great point is that, although we are 'strangers and pilgrims,' we are not to be 'other-worldly,' but 'unworldly.' This is all put in a very interesting way, but need not detain us. I will only quote one sentence from the passages about the future life and marriage: 'All that is deep and spiritual in the marriage relationship will be continued and perfected in the age to come, because that age is not another world but this world regenerated.'

Passing over a week's Studies on 'The Goal of Endeavour,' and another on 'Divine Transcendence,' we come to a week on 'Fatherhood and Sonship.' And here, again, we meet the

question of our Lord's knowledge and foreknowledge. One of the Studies is a very remarkable one. 'Shall we venture to-day,' it begins, 'to speculate reverently concerning the way in which the filial consciousness which our Lord possessed from the first prepared the way for His apparently later consciousness of Himself as Messiah? From the outset He thought of God as Father in the rich ethical sense illustrated in the parable of the Prodigal, and at the same time as the incomparable, transcendent Lord.' What influence would this have on the thoughts about the coming of the Messianic age which He would share with the pious Jewish circle in which He was brought up? Would He not think, Why does it not come? We may naturally suppose, suggests Mr. Hogg, that He would entertain three thoughts: (1) 'the Father desires to establish the Kingdom'; (2) 'for His infinitude nothing is too difficult'; (3) yet, 'just because He is Father, He will not force the human will.' What would be the inference? 'That the Father is always willing to usher in the perfect world-order,' and 'that the Kingdom might have come at any time but for man's unfitness.' Then, 'realizing that no one else had a consciousness of and trust in the Father at all approaching His own,' He would, even before the Baptism, perceive that the Father meant *Him* to be the Messiah, who, 'by His own faith, and by awakening like faith in others, would make it possible for the Father to fulfil His purpose. This striking Study closes with a few humble and reverent words: 'We have been trying to conceive the course of Christ's inner consciousness, and we may feel quite sure that we have fallen very far short of the truth, for "no one knoweth the Son save the Father." . . . Yet is not even the little glimpse into His mind which we seem to ourselves to have obtained to-day full of inspiring suggestiveness?'

The last two Weeks are headed 'A Ransom for Many' and 'It is Finished,' and bring us to the supreme topic of our Lord's Death and Resurrection. The former begins by quoting in full the great passage, Is 52¹³–53¹². We need not imagine, says Mr. Hogg, what the prophet intended to convey. The point is how Christ applied it to Himself. He 'heard the Father call Him to fulfil that Servant's mission and destiny in His own Person'; and some interesting verbal affinities are pointed out between His language and the language of the prophecy.

But a strong point is made of the fact that our Lord announced His Resurrection with the same exactness and emphasis as His Death. So His mission was not merely to die. It was to die *and to rise from the dead*. 'I lay down My life, *that I may take it again*'; and this, as Mr. Hogg also points out, Is 53 plainly predicts. One object, then, of His death was *to conquer death by rising again*. It was 'the resurrection of One who had been announcing the arrival of a new age in which for faith all things were possible—who had claimed that His own miracles were evidences of its presence—who had foretold that though He was about to submit to death He would rise again—and who then did actually die, unmistakably and by violence, *and fulfilled His prediction*.'

But what made His soul 'exceeding sorrowful'? Mr. Hogg sets aside the ordinary explanation, for which, in his opinion, the only evidence is the Cry from the Cross, and that cry, he urges, was 'not a cry of despair,' but 'the self-preserving cry of faith as it reels under the assault of despair.' And in the next Study he suggests that the 'agony' was caused by His 'horror at the sin of man in crucifying the Messiah, 'His grief at all that this sin would cost mankind in days to come'—e.g. 'Weep not for Me, but for yourselves and for your children.' 'When we realize the wild carnival of sin that makes up the story of the end, . . . can we wonder that in the garden our Lord shrank in every fibre of His being from the voluntary surrender which was to evoke all this guilt?'

One other reason for Christ's death is suggested, which cannot be put in a few words. It must suffice to quote two passages. 'In relation to sinfulness which is still obstinate and impenitent, God cannot satisfy His holiness by any weaker expression of His opposition to sin than that which is afforded by voluntarily, willingly, letting sinners vent their utmost hate upon Himself.' 'Is not this the final secret?' 'Not so much by suffering the punishment of sinners (though that also is in one sense true, since all suffering is in its origin the penal consequence of sin), as by enabling sinners openly to vent their malice against God Himself, our Lord made atonement and satisfied the righteousness of God.' This, I confess, is not very clear; nor, to me, is the further exposition of the subject, nor the illustration from the Christian treatment of unrepenting offenders enjoined by our Lord in Mt 18. But I have not space to

enter into the subject further. I will only note the absence of any direct reference to 'propitiation'; and I venture to ask, Without *that*, can we arrive at 'the final secret'?

We now come to the last Study, 'It is Finished.' In what sense, asks Mr. Hogg, could Christ feel or say 'It is finished'? The answer is, (1) 'Atonement had been made.' He had gone as a lamb to the slaughter, and now in sure faith He looked forward to a resurrection in which He should find that His soul had been made an offering for sin, and should see the pleasure of the Lord prosper in His hand.' (2) The New Covenant of Jer 31 had been introduced. (3) The way was ready for the 'full outpouring of the Spirit.' (4) The Church, the new Israel, had been founded. The last day's Study dwells on the Lord's promise of His spiritual presence, in Mt 18, 'Where two or three,' etc., and in Mt 28, 'Lo, I am with you alway.' Then, 'Do we here reach the summit of Christ's message of the Kingdom?' 'No, this unseen presence remains something less than the uttermost goal of His mission.' 'He is with us unseen "*unto the consummation of the age*," but *then* unseen no longer' (Mk 14⁶², '*Ye shall see the Son of Man*'; the 'henceforth' of Matthew and Luke being taken as an interpolation). 'He will come "*in the glory of His Father*," invisible no longer.' 'Let not us, therefore, be like the mockers who say, "*Where is the promise of His coming?*" . . . For the Lord is not slack concerning His promise, as some count slackness; but is long-suffering.'" So the book closes.

I have abstained from commenting on the views set forth in this remarkable work, and in closing I only wish to make one remark. It seems to me that we are not told what it is that would be necessary for the consummation of the Kingdom to 'tarry' no longer, but to come now. Mr. Hogg's answer would probably be 'sufficient faith in God's people,' and it seems impertinent to rejoin, 'But how much?' Yet, as he does assume the existence still, when the great day comes, of finally impenitent souls, he probably expects much the same variety of spiritual attainment as at present; and one wonders, if in the purposes of God the date depends on human readiness, what may be the necessary degree and extent of that readiness. As far as I can see, the book does not suggest a solution of this problem. Nevertheless, it is a great and an inspiring book.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ISAIAH.

ISAIAH LIII. 2.

For he grew up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground.—R.V.

1. *He grew.*—The tense is the perfect of prophetic certitude; all has been finished 'before the foundation of the world' in the Divine counsels.

2. *Before him.*—He grew up '*before him*,' before the face of Jehovah Himself. We picture some sequestered nook, remote from the din and clamour of the crowd; and we think of a childhood spent amid the quiet, sweet, balmy influences of a human home, with nature around, the child cast into the fellowship of lowly people and simple scenes, and growing up under the eye of God Himself.

3. *A tender plant, a root out of a dry ground.*—Men expected a 'plant of renown,' fairer and statelier than all the trees in the garden of God, with boughs lifted cedar-like in majesty; instead, there is a suckling, a sprout from the root of a tree that had been cut down, with nothing fair or magnificent about it. It owes nothing to the soil in which it grows. The ground is dry, an arid waste without moisture; the plant is a tender one; and in that unpropitious soil, whence no sweet juices can be drawn, it grows up stunted, dwarfed, unattractive. That is the figure.

Some time ago, as I travelled through one of the Welsh mining valleys, my eye fell upon three or four trees that were growing out of the very midst of a hill of coal waste. It was a most unlikely place in which to see a tree growing at all, and I marvelled at the vitality that could exist amid such surroundings. But I also noticed that it was a very precarious and poverty-stricken existence these trees on the coal heap were leading. Compared with the trees that were growing in the green and fertile fields near by, they were poor and sickly-looking specimens. It is hopeless to expect a strong, vigorous, beautiful plant to spring out of a 'dry ground.'¹

The meaning is missed in the lines:

Fair as a beauteous, tender flower
Amid the desert grows,
So, slighted by a rebel race,
The Heavenly Saviour rose.

Not *that*; not a beauteous, tender flower, growing fair in some desert spot, lending desolation a charm; but a tender

sapling growing in unfriendly soil, far away from 'the scent of waters,' sickly, dwarfed, without beauty. The idea is more nearly caught in the other lines:

Like a tender plant that's growing
Where no waters, kindly flowing,
No kind rains, refresh the ground,
Drooping, dying, ye shall view Him,
See no charm to draw you to Him,
There no beauty shall be found.²

I.

THE SOIL.

In this moving chapter the prophet, by the Spirit, speaks of Christ. And this is one feature about the Christ which he notices—His unexpectedness, His unaccountableness, His miraculousness. He grew up before Him as a 'root out of a dry ground.' There was nothing in the soil out of which He grew to account for Jesus.

An Italian nobleman during the stern reign of Napoleon underwent a long imprisonment. He had drunk deep of the cold rationalism of the eighteenth century and went to prison an atheist. As he paced his little court he noticed one day a slight disturbance of its hard clay floor. Then in a few days a glistening point pushed itself up through the clay and the mortar. As these rough impediments were got over, the hard sheath opened out and a delicate plant shot up into the air. The prisoner watched from day to day with deep interest the growth of the little plant, the expanding of leaves that had been daintily folded in their protecting case, the issuing of a carefully covered bud which opened out, petal after petal, into a lovely flower with provision in its calyx for the infinite renewal of the plant's life. And through the teaching of this 'lily of the field,' the atheist left his prison a believer in his Father's wisdom and his Father's love.³

1. There is nothing in the *Surroundings* of Jesus to account for Him. You cannot explain His greatness on the ground of early advantages, for He had none. The Jews were surprised. 'Whence hath this man these things?' they asked. 'Is not this the carpenter?' 'How knoweth this man letters,' they asked on another occasion, 'having never learned?' They thought of our Lord's home, they thought of His education, they thought of Nazareth, they thought of those years in the workshop; and then they thought of

² J. Culross, *The Man of Sorrows*, 78.

³ F. R. Wynne, *The Literature of the Second Century*, 92.

¹ J. D. Jones, *The Hope of the Gospel*, 1.

His words of grace, His deeds of power, and His life of absolute holiness, and it left them utterly and hopelessly bewildered. There was nothing in His upbringing and surroundings to account for Him. As far as His environment was concerned, He grew up as a 'root out of a dry ground.'

2. Jesus derived nothing from His *Nationality*; it was no general recommendation to His teaching that He was of the seed of Abraham. Why, to this day, to many minds, it is almost shameful to mention that our Saviour was a Jew. Though certainly the Jew is of an honourable race, ancient and venerable, as having been chosen by God of old, yet among the sons of men the name of Jew has not yet lost the opprobrium which long ages of cruel oppression and superstitious hate have cast upon it. There was no nation, immediately after the time of our Saviour, that the Romans ardently hated except the Jews. The Romans were peculiarly tolerant of all religions and customs; by conquest their empire had absorbed men of all languages and creeds, and they usually left them undisturbed: but the Jewish faith was too peculiar and intolerant to escape derision and hatred. After the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, the Jews were hunted down, and the connexion of Christianity with Judaism, so far from being an advantage to it, became a serious hindrance to its growth. Christianity was confounded with Judaism, and made to share the political obloquy of the Jewish nation as well as its own reproach. Had our Saviour been born in Greece, there is no doubt that as a religious teacher He would have commanded far more attention than as coming forward from Jerusalem or Nazareth. He owed nothing to His Jewish birth, for if anything good could have come out of Israel in former days, behold into what a state it had fallen,—it was dead politically, religiously, and mentally!

3. There is nothing even in *the Human Race* to explain Jesus. The race has produced great teachers and leaders like Confucius, and Buddha, and Mahomet, and Plato, and Socrates. But the fact that the race produced Confucius, and Buddha, and Mahomet, and Socrates, and Plato, and Dante, and Shakespeare does not make it a whit easier to understand how it could produce Jesus. For in the matter of wisdom and truth, a whole universe separates Jesus from the best and wisest of other teachers. There are falsities mixed up with their wisdom, but the wisdom of Jesus is

all pure gold. We outgrow their teaching. The teaching of Jesus, after nineteen centuries, remains our wonder and our inspiration. Others guess at truth. Jesus talks about the eternities in the calm and assured accents of full and perfect knowledge.

'A root out of a dry ground.' Some miles from Cairo, right in the desert, standing absolutely by itself, is a large palm tree, known locally as 'The Lone Palm Tree.' It is about four miles from the river Nile, and no one knows how it lives or whence it derives the moisture necessary for its sustenance. Visitors go to see it and discuss the mystery of its existence. Not less arid and barren than the desert of Sahara was the world of humanity from which miraculously sprang the Messiah, deriving His being, His powers, His mission from the hidden springs of Deity.

II.

THE PLANT.

The marvel of Christ's Person becomes all the more marvellous when we consider the conditions of His time and the circumstances out of which He sprang. The nature of the growth is always in accordance with the nature of the soil. You cannot expect a harvest from seed that falls on the rocky ground. If things grow at all out of dry and hard ground, they are bound to be feeble and sickly growths. But Jesus was no feeble and sickly growth. He was the 'chiefest among ten thousand,' and the 'altogether lovely.' He was like the cedar of Lebanon for strength, like the lily of the valley for fragrance and purity, like the rose of Sharon for glory. By universal consent He was the best and noblest, and the highest and holiest of mankind. And yet He grew up as a root out of a dry ground. There was nothing in His circumstances or surroundings to account for Him or explain Him. He is as surprising, as inexplicable, as miraculous, as would be, let us say, a crop of flowers springing up out of the asphalt paving of our public streets.

Owing to their geographical position, the central and western regions of South Africa are almost constantly deprived of rain. They contain no flowing streams, and very little water in the wells. The soil is a soft and light-coloured sand, which reflects the sunlight with a glaring intensity. No fresh breeze cools the air; no passing cloud veils the scorching sky. We should naturally have supposed that regions so scantily supplied with one of the first necessities of life could be nothing else than waste and lifeless deserts; and yet, strange to say, they are distinguished for their comparatively abundant vegetation, and their immense development of animal life. The evil produced by want of rain has been counteracted by the admirable foresight of the

Creator, in providing these arid lands with plants suited to their trying circumstances.' The vegetation is eminently local and special. Nothing like it is seen elsewhere on the face of the earth. Nearly all the plants have tuberous roots, buried far beneath the ground, beyond the scorching effects of the sun, and are composed of succulent tissue, filled with a deliciously cool and refreshing fluid. They have also thick fleshy leaves, with pores capable of imbibing and retaining moisture from a very dry atmosphere and soil; so that if a leaf be broken during the greatest drought, it shows abundant circulating sap. Nothing can look more unlike the situations in which they are found than these succulent roots, full of fluid when the surrounding soil is dry as dust, and the enveloping air seems utterly destitute of moisture; replete with nourishment and life when all within the horizon is desolation and death. They seem to have a special vitality in themselves; and, unlike all other plants, to be independent of circumstances. Such roots are also found in the deserts of Arabia; and it was doubtless one of them that suggested to the prophet the beautiful and expressive emblem of the text, 'He shall grow up before him as a root out of a dry ground.'¹

1. Christ created the gospel by His work; He preaches the gospel by His words; He is the gospel Himself. His Person is intrinsically superior to all the doctrines which He proclaims, and all the blessings which He confers. His individuality takes precedence of everything else. He is the Way; for no man cometh to the Father but by Him. He is the Truth; for the truth that frees and sanctifies the soul is 'the truth as it is in Jesus.' He is the Life; for he that believeth in Him, though he were dead, yet shall he live, and to know Him is life everlasting. He of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption; and the believer is said to 'put on Christ,' and not merely His salvation, to be made 'a partaker of Christ,' and not merely of His gifts, whether of grace or glory. In short, there are numerous passages in the New Testament which declare Christ *to be personally* what, in the ordinary language of life, we should say that He had done and taught and communicated.

2. All the individual life of the Christian, with its blossoms of holiness and its fruits of righteousness; all the Christian life of society, with its things that are pure, and honest, and lovely, and of good report, is but a development and a manifestation of the life of Christ in the heart and in the world; a growth and unfolding of the power, the beauty, and the sweetness that are hid in the

root of Jesse. And it is assuredly the most precious, as it is the most distinguishing, feature of the Christian religion, that it places the foundation of eternal life in living relations with a living person, rather than in the profession of a creed or the practice of a duty; that under it the believer is 'not a man who maintains the doctrine of the Trinity, or who holds justification by faith, but the man who has come to Christ, and is rooted and built up in Him.'

3. Among the problems which most occupy the minds of men to-day are problems which have to do with the work and Person of Jesus Christ. From whatever point of view we regard Him, this much we have to concede, that He is a spiritual force of the first magnitude, that He has produced results so vast and far-reaching as almost to defy computation, that He stands out from the page of history unique and incalculable. And such effects as these imply a cause sufficient to produce them. There must have been in Christ, or behind Christ, some power capable of doing the work. When we compare the Jesus of our Gospels, the work He did and the estimate in which He was held by His contemporaries, with the Christ of history, and the position which He holds to-day, there is nothing unreasonable in the assumption of the Incarnation, that He was God manifest in the flesh. No one can doubt that this is an assumption sufficient to account for the facts. The only question is whether any lesser assumption—any one involving fewer demands upon our faith—can do the same.²

What, then, shall we say of Jesus? There is only one thing that can be said of Him. He is not the product of the race. He is the gift of God. Start from purely human considerations, and Jesus remains as big a problem and as hopeless and insoluble a riddle as a root out of a dry ground. But my difficulties vanish, and I can understand Jesus when, with the Holy Church, I say that Jesus does not represent so much the ascent of man, as the descent of God; not so much the climbing of the human into the Divine, as the condescension of the Divine to the human; that His birth was not a mere birth, but an Incarnation; that Jesus is not simply Son of Mary, but Immanuel, God with us. 'I say,' said Browning, and I say it with him:

I say, the acknowledgement of God in Christ
Accepted by thy reason, solves for thee
All questions in the earth and out of it.³

¹ H. Macmillan, *Bible Teachings in Nature*, 210.

² W. B. Selbie, *The Servant of God*, 30.

³ J. D. Jones, *The Hope of the Gospel*, 13.

Ethics among Primitive Peoples.

By A. C. HADDON, M.A., Sc.D., F.R.S., FELLOW OF CHRIST'S COLLEGE AND
UNIVERSITY READER IN ETHNOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE.

IN attempting to understand the laws which govern the conduct of primitive peoples, Western standards of morality must be entirely set aside, lest one fall into the error of past generations, who proclaimed the savage to be an immoral or even an unmoral being. As a matter of fact, the savage is bound by very rigid rules of conduct, which arise out of the sheer necessity for maintaining the solidarity of the community, since in the struggle for existence under adverse conditions man as individual could never survive; indeed, it may well be that man's social instinct was a powerful factor in his emergence from the anthropoid state. Despite the views of Lang and Atkinson (*Social Origins*, 1903) and others, it may be reasonably held, with Kropotkin (*Mutual Aid*, 1902), that, apart from modifications in physical structure, the social development of man was very largely dependent upon the fact that he was a relatively weak and defenceless animal, but no doubt endued with that strong sense of sociability which engendered in him the social habits which characterize all gregarious animals. At a stage of man's fuller development the conditions would obtain which Westermarck has described (*Origin and Development of the Moral Ideas*, 1906, i. pp. 538-39): 'It may be said that, as a general rule, among savages and barbarians—with the exception, perhaps, of those who live in small family-groups—as also among the peoples of archaic culture, this duty [of assisting more distant relatives] is more prominent and extends further than amongst ourselves. The blood-tie has much greater strength, related families keep more closely together for mutual protection and aid.' The morality of primitive man is essentially social; the conduct of the individual must be regulated for the common good by immutable rules handed down from generation to generation. Thus savages are found to be intensely conservative and law-abiding folk. The good man is he who conforms strictly to that standard of conduct which by past experience has proved beneficial to society; that which is subversive of custom, disruptive, anti-social, is bad: hence the suspicion with which any innovation is regarded by chiefs

and those concerned in the maintenance of communal integrity. For humanity in these early stages the idea of individual morality is practically absent; it is a later development arising out of a growing self-consciousness. M. Durkheim and the French school of anthropologists are justified in assuming that 'in early society there was a solidarity in the actions of men as members of a social group which gave those actions a quite specific character, and makes it wholly illegitimate to suppose that they were directed by motives of the same order which set into activity the individual; and they assert that the explanation of the facts of early society is to be sought in social conditions which have as their psychological correlate or expression what they call collective representations' (Rivers, *Hibbert Journal*, x. [1912], p. 394). Primitive thought, according to Lévy-Bruhl, is totally distinct in its processes from that of civilized man, being characterized, *inter alia*, by what he terms the law of participation. 'Representations called collective,' writes Lévy-Bruhl (*Les fonctions mentales des sociétés inférieures*, 1910, p. 1), '... may be recognized by the following indications: they are common to the members of a given social group; they are transmitted from generation to generation; they are enjoined on individuals and awaken in them feelings of respect, fear, adoration, etc., as the case may be. They are not dependent on the individual for existence. Not that they imply a collective subject distinct from the individuals composing the social group, but because they possess characters which cannot be accounted for solely by the consideration of individuals as such.' As regards the law of participation the same writer says (p. 77): 'In the collective representations of primitive mentality objects, beings, phenomena, may be, in a manner incomprehensible to us, at the same time themselves and other than themselves. . . . For this mentality the opposition between one and several, the same and the other, etc., does not necessitate the affirmation of one of these terms if the other be denied, and reciprocally. . . . Often it melts away before a mystic community of essence between

beings which to our ideas could not be blended together without absurdity.' The primitive mind is prelogical in that for it connexions exist where to our minds there are none: This law of participation accounts for the effect on the child of food eaten by the father, the effect on an individual of sorcery worked by means of his hair or nail-parings, the effect on the crops or the weather of ceremonies performed by certain persons. It is the mystic participation of the individual in the community which underlies much that is puzzling to the Western mind in the ideas and institutions of savages.

We have seen that the moral law of savages is entirely social in its objective; he who fails in his observance of it commits an offence against the community, but at the outset there appears to be no idea of responsibility to any outside authority against whom a man sins in breaking the moral law. Morality is as yet perfectly distinct from religion even of the most rudimentary form, which may be defined as the acknowledgment of and dependence upon superhuman powers whether spirits or divinities. Professor Westermarck, in his chapter on 'Gods as Guardians of Morality' (*op. cit.* ii. p. 663), points out that it is by no means a universal characteristic of gods to punish vice and reward virtue, for the supernatural beings of savage belief frequently display the utmost indifference to questions of worldly morality. Ritual neglect might offend them as being sacrilegious, but otherwise they take no account of human conduct. On the other hand, many backward peoples are stated to have a belief in an 'All-father,' who may be a mythical ancestor or headman, and as such may take an interest in the morality of his descendants. Some Australian tribes now regard him as the original source of totemic and other regulations, breaches of which he will visit with punishment (A. W. Howitt, *Native Tribes of S.E. Australia*, 1904, pp. 488-508; K. Langloh Parker, *The Euahlayi Tribe*, 1905, pp. 7-9). In fact, he may be to that extent a kind of personification of the collective conscience, aiding the efforts of the elders to maintain the ancient order of things. Mr. Howitt said of the S.E. Australian tribes (*Jour. Anth. Inst.* xiii. [1884], p. 459): '... I venture to assert that it can no longer be maintained that they have no belief which can be called religious—that is, in the sense of beliefs which govern tribal and individual

morality under a supernatural sanction.' This is borne out by his later work cited above (pp. 489, 495). The high-god 'is the Headman in the sky-country, the analogue of the Headman of the tribe on the earth' (p. 491). The law-breaker incurs not the wrath of the gods but the disapproval of society, and it is to his fellow-men, or possibly to the sorcerer, that the injured party turns for help in obtaining redress. Primitive sexual morality clearly reveals this point of view: chastity *per se* is of no account, therefore the relations of young people before marriage are often subject to no restrictions; but, once a man has married a woman and paid over the bride-price to her family, he has established rights over her, any infringement of which is tantamount to theft of another man's property. The perpetrator of such an act, according to savage ideas, is not guilty of the sin of adultery—such a thing does not exist—but he has committed the crime of theft. It must be further borne in mind that the primitive ethical code enjoins practices directly opposed to Western sexual morality. In certain Australian tribes it is recognized that, though the husband has prior claim to his own wife, yet other men of his totemic kin have accessory rights over her (Spencer and Gillen, *Native Tribes of Central Australia*, 1899, pp. 62-64). Among the Todas of South India the stigma of immorality seems rather to attach to the man who grudges his wife to another; the *kashtvainol*, or grudging people, Rivers tells us, constitute one group who find it difficult to reach the next world after death (*The Todas*, 1906, p. 530).

Let us consider briefly the ethical standards obtaining among certain primitive peoples who have been carefully studied, beginning with the simplest form of society.

The *Andaman Islanders* of the Bay of Bengal live in small local groups without organized polity; but in every community some man pre-eminent in skill in hunting and warfare, wisdom and kindness, takes the lead, holding such position only in virtue of these qualities. Respect for senior, capable, kindly men is one great factor conducing to social cohesion. A man only becomes an independent member of the community on marriage, which is not an established fact until the birth of a child. The hardest work of the community falls on the young unmarried men, and any game they kill is regarded as common property; he who

continues a celibate after the proper age for marriage is described as 'a very bad man'—an opinion revealing a social standard of morality. On the other hand, murder, assault, theft, or destruction of property is regarded simply as a personal offence for which vengeance may be taken on the culprit. But if a member of one community kill or injure the member of another, the whole community must take the matter up and avenge itself. Persistent celibacy, failure in respect towards elders, marital unfaithfulness, and laziness are regarded as wrong (which is equivalent to anti-social), but there is no punishment for such shortcomings other than loss of esteem. Promiscuous intercourse between the sexes is customary before marriage. (The above account is based on the observations of Mr. A. R. Brown, whose book on the Andaman Islanders will appear shortly.)

The *Torres Straits Islanders* had a system of morality based on the obligations of social life and deriving no sanction or support from religion; individual morality had scarcely emerged, for there was no idea of personal responsibility to any higher power outside the community. The rudiments of this sense are perhaps traceable in their attitude towards the spirits of the departed among the Eastern Islanders. Ghosts, if stunted in the matter of funeral ceremonies, might feel resentment and cause strong winds to destroy their relatives' houses or gardens; or their displeasure might be aroused because their children were neglected or wronged, or their property taken by those who had no claim to it. No doubt in the past such fear of the ghost's wrath had a deterrent effect on wrongdoers, and helped to keep the people in the straight path of virtue (*Torres Straits Reports*, vol. vi. [1908], p. 127). These islanders were very carefully studied by the Cambridge Anthropological Expedition in 1898; they are rapidly becoming modified by the influence of missionaries and traders, and are borrowing the moral concepts of higher cultures. A definite system of morals was inculcated when lads were initiated into manhood, and there is no ground for suspecting any missionary influence in the statements made by the natives. The following is the code *in extenso* of the Western Islanders as related in jargon English:—

We tell you and you think every year and every day. What word we speak out, you must put it along your heart.

You think for yourself, you're no stone or firewood, you're a man just like me.

You no play with small play-canoe, or with toy-spear; that all finish now. You no play with boy and girl now; you a man now and no boy.

If any man meets you walking along the road and you are carrying sweet-potatoes, or coco-nuts, or other food, you offer it to him without his having to ask you for some; he will then call you a good boy, but if you do not he will call you a bad boy.

Look here! Suppose a man send you for anything, you must do it quick—you no too much run about. Tell you do something, you do it quick. You should carry things for old men.

When all men stay at the *kwod* (ceremonial ground) you no walk upright, you stoop down as you walk. Do not stand upright in the presence of the old men. You must not speak to the men in the *kwod*.

You must not touch anything belonging to another man. S'pose you take anything and you lose it, he will call you a bad boy. You must ask him first, then if you lose it the man will say, 'Oh! it's my fault, I gave it to you.'

You no steal. You no take thing belong man without leave. If you see a fish-spear and take it, s'pose you break it and you no got spear, how you pay man? S'pose you see a dugong-harpoon in a canoe and take it and man he no savvy, then you lose it or break it, how you pay him? You no got dugong-harpoon.

You must take cold heart (*i.e.* you must have a quiet temper).

You must not talk scandal (*i.e.* if he heard about any one committing adultery he was to remain silent and not talk about it, and so make it worse) nor swear.

You no go and talk a lie, you speak straight. When you want to speak some word, you speak true, no tell lie; to tell lies no good.

You work hard to get plenty fish, and dugong, and turtle. You make garden, then you full up of food.

S'pose man ask you for food or water or anything else, you give him half of what you got. If you do, you good boy; if you do not, no one like you.

S'pose you're a bad boy, by and by you dead quick—sorcery man kill you—same too s'pose you speak too much or you play in *kwod*.

Give food to sorcerer should he want any.

S'pose you got plenty fish, you give mother and father before you give to brother; if you have a wife, give her a little, and plenty to parents, for they have had hard work along of you.

Look after mother and father; never mind if you and your wife have to go without. Give half of all your fish to your parents; don't be mean.

Don't speak bad word to mother. Father and mother all along same as food in belly; when they die you feel hungry and empty.

Mind your uncles too and cousins.

S'pose a man talk bad to your brother, you help him, you talk too.

If your brother is going out to fight, you help him; don't let him go first, but go together.

You no like girl first; if you do, girl laugh at you and call

you a woman (*i.e.* the young man must not propose marriage to a girl, but must wait for her to speak first).

You no marry your cousin, she all same sister.

You no marry sister of your mate, or by and by you will be ashamed; mates all same brothers (but mates, *i.e.* two close friends, may like brothers marry two sisters).

If a woman walk alone, you no follow; by and by man look, he call you bad name.

If a canoe is going out to fight another place, you go in canoe; no stop behind to steal women.

The injunctions were: remembrance of admonitions, reticence, thoughtfulness, respectful behaviour, prompt obedience, generosity, diligence, kindness to parents and other relatives in deed and word, truthfulness, helpfulness, manliness, discretion in dealing with women, quiet temper. Bravery, ferocity, endurance of pain and hardship, and other warlike qualities, were regarded as great virtues. The prohibitions were against theft, borrowing without leave, shirking duty, talkativeness, abusive language, talking scandal, marriage with certain individuals, revealing the sacred secrets.

The Eastern Islanders gave sound moral and practical instruction to youths at initiation. In their case the social welfare depended upon horticulture, and this fact is reflected in certain precepts of the code. A youth must not spend his days on the reef catching fish and neglect his garden; he might go on the reef once a week or so. He was strictly enjoined to make a good and large garden, and was taught the best method: *e.g.* 'When you got *ketai* (a kind of climbing yam), you plant him along big tree, you keep him along tree for three or four years.' He was told to build a large house for himself and surround it with a fence. There were admonitions against stealing other men's garden stuff or wives, against loss of temper, talking scandal, and so on, and death was threatened to any who should divulge secrets of the Malu cult to a woman or an uninitiated man.

The above precepts represent the regular course of instruction, but in individual cases an unruly youth might be reprimanded, as is shown by the following hypothetical instance given by two Western Islanders. If the eldest son of a family were bad-tempered, quarrelsome, and unkind in his talk, a number of men would come and give him a friendly warning: 'You are the eldest brother, but you are like an unsteady pole that wobbles in a tide-way. Your youngest brother is

a steady fellow and lives quietly. You had better do the same or the *maidelaig* (sorcerer) will have something to say to you; he is watching you. You must take care of yourself. We now warn you, in case you may want to amend your ways. It would be better for you to stop that bad fashion and to follow your youngest brother's example and remain quiet.'

As regards the behaviour of the people in everyday life, the men seem to have treated their wives well on the whole and to have been affectionate to them; parents were very fond of their children, and no case of cruelty was heard of. The shame felt when any tabu was broken which regulated the behaviour of certain persons to one another was a manifestation of domestic morality.

Sexual morality: the highest moral opprobrium attached to incest, *i.e.* marriage or connexion within the clan or between those considered as too nearly related. This is an example of a social convention which was of fundamental biological importance to the community. Irregular relations with women were spoken of as 'stealing,' girls being regarded as the property of their fathers, and wives as that of their husbands; the only party wronged was the owner. There seems to have been no word for fornication or adultery other than 'theft,' though this does not necessarily imply the absence of a corresponding concept. It seems that chastity before marriage was formerly practically unknown, but decorum was always observed. Unbridled licence was probably never indulged in, public opinion exercising a restraining influence. In the case of the rape of a married woman or adultery with her, the aggrieved husband might require the death of both parties, and he would take over the wives of the co-respondent if he were married, but sometimes he would satisfy himself with a fine. However, the women seem to have been faithful wives as a rule.

Commercial morality: it was customary for canoes to be purchased from New Guinea on the instalment system, and this could not have persisted unless there had been honest dealing between debtor and creditor. Repudiation of debts would have resulted in a cessation of the supply of canoes, and then 'how we get fish, or turtle, or dugong, we hungry all the time, that no good'; also there would have been fighting.

Crime: any infringement of the rules of the community was regarded as an offence against

society rather than a definite violation of law. Many acts of the people were of a social nature; a clan or group must perform certain ceremonies for their own or the public weal. Such practices were regulated by tradition, and any inaccuracy of performance on the part of an individual might impair their efficacy and would clearly constitute a crime against society. Most tabus and regulations arose in the interests of the community, though some were designed to strengthen the authority of the old men. Any infringement of custom weakened that authority and tended towards individualism and disintegration of the community, which was a danger to be guarded against. Crimes against the person would be punished by the injured party if strong enough; if not, he would enlist the help of the sorcerer or else of his friends.

Revenge: the blood-feud between different communities was a recognized custom, but private wrongs were often avenged by the community.

Homicide was not *a priori* reprehensible: a man had the right to kill his own wife or children since they were his property; and foeticide and infanticide were not uncommon, being a social necessity in view of the limited food-supply. No stigma attached to any one who sought the sorcery-man's help to compass the sickness or death of an enemy. The murder of one's clansman, relative, or friend was a matter for personal revenge. To kill foreigners in fair fight or by treachery was most meritorious, and he who brought home skulls covered himself with glory and found favour with women. In the early days any stranger or person arriving unbidden was done to death—a custom arising doubtless as an act of communal self-preservation, for outside the island lay the great hostile unknown whose emissaries boded harm.

Among the *Elema tribes of the Papuan Gulf* moral instruction is given to youths when they are secluded for the initiation ceremonies. The Rev. J. Holmes states (*Jour. Anth. Inst.* xxxii. [1902], p. 418) that admonitions respecting a man's duty to his tribe have always the first place. When choosing a wife, the primary consideration is that the girl be one likely to bear healthy children who will be a strength to the tribe; if she is barren, the husband's obligation ceases. If twins are born it is right to bury one of them, because no mother can nourish two children at once successfully, and two weak men are not the credit to the tribe that

one strong man can be. No one will be responsible for the future conduct of an illegitimate child; it is best, therefore, to strangle it. If a mother dies, no one can be relied on to nourish her child satisfactorily; so it is well that it die too. Much attention is devoted to the art of sorcery in order to impress on the minds of the initiates how great is the power of sorcerers. Careful advice is given as to tribal duties; each individual must regard the tribal enemies as his own. The tribal conscience of the Papuan Gulf is fully attuned to Nature's law of the survival of the fittest: personal desires and all else are subordinated to the great end of adding to the strength of the tribe.

In *Kaiser Wilhelms-Land* boys undergoing the *asa* rites are taught certain moral precepts: to be generous, not to steal, to behave properly towards the women.

The *Bushongo*, a Bantu people living in the Upper Kasai basin, Southern Congo, have advanced in their social organization to the point of having a well-defined chieftainship, about which their polity centres. Their morality, as expressed in their traditional law, is based on fairly high ideas. Actions causing material harm to the community or to individuals are regarded as crimes; drunkenness is an attenuating circumstance, and held in no special disapprobation. Incest is a crime against the community, and in the few cases on record the man has always committed suicide on account of his public disgrace. Hospitality—that is, food and shelter—must be given to strangers regardless of their tribe. Fraud, lying, and bad faith are intrinsically evil deeds; cowardice is punished only by universal disapproval (Torday and Joyce, *Annales du Musée du Congo Belge*, 1911, p. 75). No mention is made of any religious sanction attaching to the code of morals of the Bushongo. The all-powerful creator, Chembe, since leaving this world, seems to have concerned himself very little with the human race, except for an occasional appearance to some individual in a dream: no actual cult is paid to him (*op. cit.* p. 120). Among the Western Bushongo, youths undergo initiation at which they are taught the law (*nkanda*) as follows:—

1. Above all men is the Chief: absolute obedience is due to him; his person and possessions are to be respected; there is one chief only, the Nyimi; none other must be obeyed.
2. Obedience and respect are due to the chief's descendants.

3. Respect the nakedness of your mother; look not upon her while she is bathing; when going to your parents' home, do not enter suddenly; say who you are, and wait till you are invited within, lest you enter at an inopportune moment.
4. Respect and obedience are due to parents from their children.
5. If you take in a temporary mistress, arrange it so that your parents see nothing.
6. Do not use indecent language before your parents (*e.g.* when going aside into the bush for purposes of nature, invent an excuse).
7. If your father's loin-cloth is displaced so that you see his buttocks, tell him; if your mother is in like case say nothing, it is her daughter who should tell her of it and not her son. You must not make your mother blush.
8. Respect the body of your parents; ask your friends to dress them for burial, for fear of your seeing them naked; do not perform this duty yourself.
9. Do not look at a woman while she is lying in.
10. Do not undress a woman in public.
11. Do not beat your wife; but if married people quarrel, do not interfere.
12. Be just to your enemy; if he is in danger of drowning, rescue him; if he is attacked, go to his aid; if the chief sends for him, do not refrain from giving the message in the hope that he may be punished.
13. Do not allow several persons to attack one.
14. In warfare avoid killing, but defend yourself with courage.
15. Do not steal; if you want a thing, ask the owner for it; if he refuses, do without it.
16. Be faithful to your wife while she is with child.
17. Respect the wives of the following persons: the king, the king's sons, your friends, your slaves, your sons, your father, your uncles, your brothers, your cousins; also respect your female cousins and your cousins' daughters.
18. Do not waste your substance in gaming.
19. Do not lie to a man of your own tribe (*op. cit.* pp. 85-86).

These prohibitions are called *Ikina Nyimi*, royal prohibitions, and are distinct from the *Ikina Bari*, tabus on animals, which seem to be a degenerate form of totemism.

The *Todas*, living on the jungle-surrounded plateau of the Nilgiri Hills in South India, have a code of morality presenting many points of interest. Their whole life centres in the care of their sacred cattle and the work of the dairy, from which women are rigidly excluded. Rivers (*The Todas*, 1906, p. 554) doubts whether crime can be said to exist among them. 'Acts such as infanticide are committed . . . but since these are the outcome of custom they are not crimes from the Toda point of view.' They have a code of offences

against the dairy (p. 295), but these must be regarded as sins rather than crimes, since the civil authority, the *naim*, takes no account of them; they are punished directly by the gods, and various ceremonies of an expiatory character take place. The list of offences includes quarrelling between people of the same clan at a festival, quarrelling in the dairy, stealing milk, butter, or ghi from the dairy; but these are regarded as sins of sacrilege against the dairy, not as crimes against the persons concerned. Rivers heard of no offence against property in any other connexion; ornaments and clothing are apparently never stolen. Cases of assault or murder seem unheard of; the only instance of murder on record is that described in the legend of Kwoten. 'The Todas may take part in the murder of a Kurumba who has been working magic, but this is of course no crime from the Toda point of view, but an obvious method of self-defence, for it is believed that the only way of stopping Kurumba sorcery is to kill the sorcerer' (p. 555). Suicide by strangling is said to have been a recognized custom among the Todas. As regards sexual intercourse, there is little restriction of any kind; several Todas assured Rivers that unfaithfulness was no motive for divorce, being in no way regarded as wrong; there seems to be no word in the Toda language for adultery. From the point of view of the savage, Toda sexual morality is certainly very low; the custom of polyandry seems to have weakened the idea of the husband's proprietary rights in the wife to a very great extent. Even the abhorrence of incest, which is almost universal, seems absent in the case of the Todas. It may fairly be said that the whole communal conscience is concentrated on the dairy, the ordinary relations of life being of subsidiary importance.

The inculcation of morality.—The folk-tales of backward peoples the world over cannot be considered to offer any ethical teaching; not that the sentiments expressed in them are immoral—they are simply non-moral. Some may relate how misfortune followed wrongdoing, but as a rule actions regarded by the people themselves as offences are recorded without comment (*cf. Torres Straits Reports*, vol. v. p. 273). The example of the older men serves as incentive to good behaviour—that is to say, to conduct in accordance with the accepted standard. The initiation ceremonies, however, afford the supreme occasion for moral instruction.

These rites are of the deepest significance: they represent the new birth to the responsibilities of manhood, the putting away of childhood once and for all. At the psychological moment in his physical and mental development, when his young virility is surging within him, a boy is taken apart into the bush with his fellow-initiates, separated entirely from the wonted environment, restricted by tabus on certain foods, and compelled to undergo tests of endurance and to witness ceremonies which fill him with awe and it may be alarm. It is during this momentous period in a boy's life that all instruction in tribal lore is imparted and he learns what it behoves a man to do. The time of seclusion may last for months and in a few instances for years. Some initiatory rites are pantomimic representations of what novices must avoid in future, and have at first sight a highly immoral appearance: for instance, at the initiation ceremonies of the Coast Murring of S.E. Australia, the *kabos* (instructors) made use of an inverted manner of speaking, saying one thing when another was intended, their object being to break the boys of a habit of telling lies and to make them for the future truth-telling (A. W. Howitt, *Nat. Tribes of S.E. Australia*, p. 533). Various moral offences are represented, and the novices are threatened with death or violence if they repeat such actions. Obscene gestures are made on these occasions by some tribes, but their purpose is to shock the initiates, and any sign of levity is suppressed instantly by a blow. As regards phallic observances met with among the Australians and elsewhere, Professor Hutton Webster points out (*Primitive Secret Societies*, 1908, p. 50, n. 2) that they are to be interpreted from this primitive point of view of instruction and warning. 'But, remembering that the initiation ceremonies are intended primarily as a preparation for marriage, we shall not be surprised to find much instruction in sexual matters, conveyed sometimes in a most direct and startling fashion.' Among many tribes the whole education of youths is compressed into this short period. They are taught the complicated class and totemic divisions on which the marriage system is based, the tribal songs, dances, games, and traditions. When the initiation cere-

monies are over, Kurnai boys (Victoria) remain for months in the bush, gaining their own living and learning self-control, manly duties, and such virtues as to obey the old men, to live peaceably with their friends and share all they have with them, to avoid interfering with girls and married women, and to observe the food restrictions.

In Africa, too, the initiation of youths and often of girls at puberty is very widespread, and instruction of various kinds is imparted during their seclusion. Basuto boys are beaten frequently and mercilessly. They are told to mend their ways, to quit themselves like men, fear theft and adultery, honour their parents, and obey their chiefs. Bechuana lads receive much the same treatment. At the close of initiation a long exhortation is delivered. All objects connected with their seclusion are burnt, and they may never again visit the scene of seclusion, where they have left all evil dispositions and follies of childhood. Professor Hutton Webster, from whom quotations have been made above, has an admirable chapter on 'The Training of the Novice' (*op. cit.* ch. iv.), in which many additional instances are cited. 'Obedience to the elders or tribal chiefs, bravery in battle, liberality towards the community, independence of maternal control, steadfast attachment to the traditional customs and the established moral code, are social virtues of great importance in rude communities.'

It would be easy to multiply instances of ethical codes and of initiation ceremonies at which these are inculcated, but it is unnecessary to do so. The social morality of the Torres Straits Islanders has been dealt with at considerable length, because it seems desirable to give an approximately complete view of the moral concepts of a particular people and of the effects of these upon them. In the majority of other cases such information is fragmentary, though doubtless more rigorous investigation would reveal similar conditions. The object of this article has been to point out the futility of applying the moral standards of higher civilizations to the conduct of primitive peoples, and the impossibility of justly appreciating the social relations and ideals of a people without taking into account their environment and mode of life.

In the Study.

Recent History and Historical Questions.

The Eastern Roman Empire.

A CURIOUS change has passed over the writing of history. Once upon a time the historian paid as much regard to the manner of his writing as to the matter of it. Now all endeavour is given to the discovery of the truth; the historians of most repute make nothing of its presentation. Gibbon, Macaulay, Froude—you can tell that a torn-off page is theirs; but it takes all the insight of an accomplished scholar to distinguish Trevelyan from Taylor, or Oman from Bury.

So we are not to expect the fascination of a distinguished English style in the reading of Professor Bury's new volume. It gives us *A History of the Eastern Roman Empire* from the fall of Irene to the accession of Basil I., that is, the period of sixty-five years from 802 A.D. to 867 A.D. (Macmillan; 12s. net). It is thus a direct continuation, but on a larger scale, of the same author's *History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene*. Dr. Bury calls the period the Amorion epoch, from the birthplace (Amorion) of Michael II. It is not an epoch that has greatly attracted the historian, whether mediæval or modern. For that very reason it attracts Professor Bury. And for the double reason it attracts us. For if we do not look for distinction of style, we know that we shall obtain a picture of this neglected period as nearly accurate and reliable as the present state of knowledge will allow it to be made.

Now there is one strong reason why we should desire to be made familiar with the facts. This was the period in which the hundred and twenty years' struggle over images came to an end. Dr. Bury tells the story in his own matter-of-fact manner. And it is, perhaps, some explanation of his manner that it is a satisfaction to him to be able to say of the conclusion that it was a compromise. The icons were restored, and the iconoclasts were pronounced heretic: but henceforth only pictures appear in churches, sculpture is excluded. The word *icon* takes on a new and narrower meaning.

Professor Bury is much troubled with the difficulty of distinguishing truth from fiction. He lays down the principle at the very beginning of

his book that the incredible is not necessarily untrue. And so throughout the book he sifts the most absurd stories with serious face, and keeps the grain of reality he believes to be in them. And when he can find no grain of reality, he still records the story on the plea that 'it may have a certain value for the history of culture.'

Pitt and Napoleon.

Dr. Holland Rose is the biographer of both Pitt and Napoleon. And now he has gathered together some chips from his biographical workshop and offered them under the title of *Pitt and Napoleon, Essays and Letters* (Bell; 10s. 6d. net).

Books of this kind are usually made up of rejected chapters, chapters deservedly rejected. Dr. Rose's essays are as valuable as any chapter in his *Pitt* or his *Napoleon*. They are written for the discussion of points of dispute or entanglement. They are therefore necessary to a complete knowledge of the career of his heroes. And it does not much matter whether they are read before the biographies or after.

There is, for example, a discussion of the true significance of Trafalgar. Nelson believed that the destruction of Napoleon's fleet would mean the destruction of Napoleon. That was not so. But the victory of Trafalgar compelled Napoleon to abandon every method of humbling England but one, that is, to isolate her from the trade of the Continent and so reduce her in time to submission. The plan was not statesmanlike so much as inevitable, and it ended in the ruin of Napoleon himself.

In another essay Dr. Rose explains the victory of Waterloo. It was due to Napoleon's impervious confidence in himself. Like the Pharisee of the parable, he was self-righteous and despised others. Among the rest he despised Wellington. There is in this volume the record of an interview between Napoleon and Major I. H. Vivian in Elba. The question was put direct to Napoleon, Did he think Wellington a great general? He answered shortly, Yes. Major Vivian pressed it. The only answer was a sharper Yes, yes.

The letters which the volume contains are now published for the first time. They belong to the life of Pitt.

Education.

It is by experiment that we obtain our knowledge in education as in other things. And truly we are experimenting at present. The sorrow is that we have to make our experiments on boys and girls. No consideration, however, daunts the educational theorist. Here is Mr. J. Howard Moore coolly telling us that our present methods in education are radically, aye and criminally, wrong. We inform our children about the stars and omit all knowledge of their own bodies. We do worse. We cram them with physical facts and neglect the weightier matters of life and conduct. It is all true. We must reform. Mr. Howard Moore in his book on *Ethics and Education* (Bell; 3s. net) writes quite convincingly. However we may dislike changes, we must recognize that a change is necessary here. And the sooner we make it the better.

Bede.

There are excellent editions of some of Bede's works in the original. Dr. Charles Plummer may almost be said to owe his fame to his edition. But until now there has been no really reliable translation. The translation of Giles was a considerable improvement upon that of Stevens, but it was far from perfect. Moreover, it was issued so long ago as 1842, and a revision of it has long been due. That—so far as the Ecclesiastical History is concerned—has been undertaken and most satisfactorily accomplished by A. M. Sellar, formerly Vice-Principal of Lady Margaret College, Oxford. The title is *Bede's Ecclesiastical History of England* (Bell & Sons; 5s.). The revision has been carried out with the aid of all the important work done on Bede during the last half-century, and also, as we are informed in the preface, with the assistance of living Bede scholars. The translation is furnished with short footnotes. These notes, the editor tells us, are not intended to compete with Plummer's notes, but to present in a short and convenient form the substance of the views held by trustworthy authorities on matters that are obscure or in dispute.

Historical Biography.

Fighters and Martyrs for the Freedom of Faith is the title of a bulky book in close type which

contains biographical sketches of Wyclif, Savonarola, Luther, Tindale, Knox, Barrowe, Robinson, Cromwell, Milton, Fox, Bunyan, Watts, Wesley, Carey, Williams, and Livingstone. The writer of the book is the Rev. Luke S. Walmsley; the publishers are Messrs. James Clarke & Co. (3s. 6d. net). It is a book that ought to have come out at Christmas, but it will keep till the Christmas following, and then it will be one of the best of gifts for aspiring boy or hero-worshipping girl.

Jerusalem in History.

In the long list of the 'Mediæval Town' series issued by Messrs. Dent, no volume could have been harder to compress within the limits while retaining the necessary interest than the volume on Jerusalem. *The Story of Jerusalem* (4s. 6d. net), written by Col. Sir C. M. Watson, and illustrated by Geneviève Watson, covers the whole long history of the most wonderful city in the world, records many an incident in detail, and carries the reader on, absorbed and delighted, to the last page. Sir Charles Watson was the inevitable choice for this volume. We doubt if there is another Englishman who knows the whole history of Jerusalem so intimately.

Biblical History.

Professor Foakes Jackson has adapted his *Biblical History of the Hebrews* for the use of students who are beginning the serious study of the Old Testament. The title of the new book, for it is as good as new, is *A Biblical History for Junior Forms* (Cambridge: Heffer; 2s. 6d.).

Independency.

Faith, Freedom, and the Future is a fine alliteration. And it is more. It is the title of a new book by the Rev. P. T. Forsyth, D.D., Principal of Hackney College, a book of history, the history of Independency, but of which the subject is really Authority, that subject which most urgently demands cautious and well-informed consideration. It is the title of a book in which the alternative 'Authority or Subjectivity' is seriously and thoroughly considered by one who loves liberty of spirit so much that he is most anxious it should not be used as a primrose path to licence of the

flesh. In other words, Dr. Forsyth recognizes, and recognizes gladly, that the old idea of Authority as an external imposition is gone; but greatly fears that it is likely to be replaced by an authority that is yet more capricious and more tyrannical, the authority of every man's own opinion. And how does he hope to prevent that? By showing that history is against it. He traces the history of the ideas of Authority and Independence throughout the experience of the Church, beginning at the Reformation. As a historical exercise it is delightful. But all the way there are also very pleasant excursions to places, both in Scripture and out of it, where the Word of God has made itself a presence and a power. It is the power of that presence that constitutes Authority, that and that alone.

The book is published by Messrs. Hodder & Stoughton (5s.).

Race-Power.

The Torch is the title of a volume, first published in 1905, which contains eight lectures on 'Race-Power in Literature,' delivered before the Lowell Institute of Boston by Mr. George Edward Woodberry (Macmillan; 5s. 6d. net). The thesis of the book is this. Mankind in the process of civilization stores up race-power, in one form or another, so that it is a continually growing fund. Literature, pre-eminently, is such a store of spiritual race-power, derived originally from the historical life or from the general experience of men, and transformed by imagination so that all which is not necessary falls away from it and what is left is truth in its simplest, most vivid and vital form. Mythology, chivalry, and the Scriptures are three such sifted deposits of the past. After setting forth his thesis, Mr. Woodberry illustrates it by means of the Titan myth, and then applies it to the works of Spenser, Milton, Wordsworth, and Shelley. He shows, or tries to show, that 'the essential greatness and value of these poets are due to the degree in which they availed themselves of the race-store.' The greatest poets 'have always been the best scholars of their time, not in the encyclopædic sense that they knew everything, but in the sense that they possessed the living knowledge of their age, so far as it concerns the human soul and its history.'

Mediæval Canon Law.

In a very recent deliverance setting forth the legal case for Disendowment, Mr. Ellis J. Griffith, K.C., M.P., leader of the Welsh Liberal members in the House of Commons, lays down the position as follows:—

'Modern historical research, since the date of the discussion on the question in the House of Commons in connexion with the Welsh Disestablishment Bill of 1895, has completely shattered the theory of continuity put forward by the late Professor Freeman and Lord Selbourne. Professor Maitland, in his work on the *Roman Canon Law in the Church of England*, has advanced arguments to establish the absolute identity'—will the reader please note?—'of the ecclesiastical legal system of the pre-Reformation Church of England with that of the contemporary Church of Rome, which the controversialists on your side have never attempted to answer.'

That can no longer be said. For in a volume entitled *The Canon Law in Mediæval England* (Murray; 6s. net), the Rev. Arthur Ogle, M.A., Rector of Otham, Maidstone, attempts to answer Maitland. He writes his book for that sole purpose. He denies that Maitland's authority is 'so decisive as it has become the fashion to assert.' And thus, though disclaiming any political intention, but claiming to be a historian pure and simple, he endeavours to show that there is 'neither moral nor legal right in favour of the disendowment of the Church in Wales.'

England's Industrial Development.

However they may vote, it is certain that the vast majority of British electors are neither convinced Tariff Reformers nor confirmed Free Traders. They still want to know. It is for that great multitude that Mr. Arthur D. Innes has written a historical survey of commerce and industry, and published it under the title of *England's Industrial Development* (Rivingtons; 5s. net). 'My purpose,' says Mr. Innes, 'has been to treat the whole subject simply as a historian, without identifying myself with any economic school; without any intention of supplementing the armoury of the devotees of Richard Cobden or the disciples of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain, the advocates of Social Democracy or the champions of Indi-

individualism. I have made it my aim to state facts so far as they are ascertainable, and to give an intelligible explanation of the principles which rightly or wrongly have guided economic action.' The volume has something of the appearance of the school book, and it does possess the school book's simplicity and accuracy. But while the son may get it up for an examination, the father may read it on the railway.

Virginibus Puerisque.

This is the most momentous and it may be the most memorable year in cricket ever known in England, and it is no surprise to find that the children's preacher is turning the event to account. The Rev. James Learmount has issued a volume of 'Fifty-two Fresh-air Talks to Young Folk,' giving it the title of *God's Out of Doors* (Allenson; 3s. 6d.). Here is one of the 'talks.'

Guard Well Your Wickets.

A German officer not long ago said that British people, wherever they go, early set up two things—first of all a church, and next a cricket ground. And surely that is a right thing to do, to try to look after the whole man. The two things are not incompatible, and some of the happiest days I have ever known have been spent with a cricket club which I started in connexion with my church. But no one to-day argues that religion must have nothing to do with cricket or with recreation. The cricket field, at all events, is a recognized training-ground for the battle of life.

The Australians are here. The summer sun is pouring out his glory. The two things go together—cricket and sunshine.

The great thing this year is, of course, the 'test' matches. Will England win or lose the 'rubber'? The term 'test' is most suggestive in common life. There are some who say that the test matches of life are not played on gala days when everything is smooth and the sun is shining. They are played, we are told, in the stern battle for bread every day in hard times. That is largely true; but I fancy that the real test match of life is fought under cricket conditions. When the weather is fine and the road smooth, and the sun shines, and all goes well, that is apt to be more fatal to a man's real life than the hard battle. It is a hard test

when you ask a man to be good and earnest when all is going well, and money is plentiful, and health is good. A man often has his wicket knocked out then, who, when the pitch is sticky, and the ground heavy, and the wind cold, would keep up his wicket. He would be all attention under hard circumstances; he would feel that then he must be at his best. A man needs to be great friends with the Captain of his salvation when all is going swimmingly.

The player in life's great test matches is there as a pupil of the Captain. We are told to-day that a certain player is a replica of another player; he has been the pupil of a certain great player, and has reproduced the style of his master. That is the idea in the game of life. Christ, our Captain, gives His life to His followers, and men must see that life cropping out everywhere in them as really as men see the style of one cricketer produced in another. Men do not say of the player I have in my mind that he is a mere copy of his master, but that he has become his master; he has not only copied, but the very spirit of the teacher has entered into him, and the same strokes, the same freedom and ability, are shown by him. The ability of both is recognized, and they are generally sent in to take the 'first knock' in the games. They are able, as a rule, to wear down the bowling. That is the idea for the Christian life.

Cricket as played in our county teams is a tremendous strain upon the players. I saw it asserted not long ago that cricketers of this type are short-lived. At first sight the conditions of cricket appear to be entirely in favour of the players—fresh air and sunshine are theirs in large measure. But there is great mental and nervous strain involved. The well-known cricketer is, it is said, a serious-looking person. Often his livelihood is at stake. The innings is awaited with apprehension if a man has any nerves at all.

A breakdown in batting means awful mortification of spirit. The bowler is often at the mercy of the batsman in fine weather and on good wickets, and *vice versa*. Fielding is perhaps the greatest strain of all upon the nerves. All are anxious to do well, and the thousands of keen eyes of the spectators, and often their hisses and hootings if a ball is missed, are very trying. British crowds are the fairest in the world, but even in Britain we know something about 'horse-play.'

We cannot too often remember that no one is more sorry than the man who drops a catch or lets a ball get past him, and a hostile demonstration is not calculated to brace his nerves for the next chance.

If you look at the hands of some of our cricketers, you would be surprised to see how by constantly gripping the bat and straining the hands when catching swift balls, all the fingers are curiously shaped and deformed. Cricket is a keen game, and demands the strained attention and the hearty, fearless action of the whole man. It is every bit as hard and trying as the battle of life; it is only because it is a game that it is not felt to be so.

The fact of the matter is, first-class cricket is really too serious, there is not enough of the 'festival' order about it, and many people think that some slow cricketers deserve 'barracking' when they resort to stone-walling, late starts, and tea intervals. The game tends to ruin through averages and statistics and county championship tables. All these things encourage men to play for their own hands, and the glorification of a century by the papers, even if it has been made at funereal pace, earns too much glory. One glorious hour of Jessop's scientific slogging is more to be desired than many days of tedious and ignoble play. One 'sticker' is enough for any team. What happiness and exhilaration Jessop, Tyldesley, Lord Dalmeny, or A. E. Lawton have given to thousands of people by their skill, daring, and pluck in their seemingly easy display of 'fire-works.' If cricket is to live, there must be more venture, more go, more aggressiveness on the part of the players. If men in business hugged their

opportunities to make money as some players hug their bats and keep on stone-walling, bankruptcy would be the certain end. We want less abnormally cautious play, and cricket will continue to be our great British game in spite of its great winter rival—football. Less of the coldly-calculating spirit, mathematical formula and rules visible to the naked eye of the onlooker, Mr. Cricketer and we will all like you better and encourage you more. As Mr. Knight puts it, 'Alertness and elasticity of mind no less than of body are the very life of cricket. Without them we get either slackness or boredom.'

Let none of us run down cricket and its crowds. It is infinitely better that men should be out in the sunshine watching cricket, with all its beautiful exhibitions of skill and endurance, than that they should be engaged in card-playing, or domino-playing, or fuddling in a public-house. Cricket is a fine counter attraction to degrading pleasures, and a fine relaxation after a week's monotonous work amidst the perpetual motion of machinery.

Let me give you some words to remember when at cricket—they are taken from the book *On Playing the Game*, by the Rev. Samuel Marriot: 'Guard well your wickets, viz. Truth, Honour, Purity. The batsmen who score well and are reliable, being always near the top of the averages, are recognized by their self-knowledge, self-reverence, and self-control. Dr. Grace says the duty of a batsman is to make runs, so attend diligently to your "scoring sheet," which is your character. Play well, and "funk" nothing. . . . And in the Great Test Match of Life may you have a glorious innings, and Heaven's ovation on entering the Great Pavilion.'

The Doctrine of the Incarnation in the Creeds.

BY THE REV. A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

II.

(1) THE Creeds tried from the standpoint of personal faith as the Christian of to-day exercises it are disappointing both as regards what is included and what is excluded. The Apostles' Creed is expressly an individual confession; and the Athanasian Creed declares that 'Whosoever would

be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith. Which Faith except any one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.' The Nicene and Chalcedonian symbols are bishops' creeds, rather than laymen's, and are a declaration of the common

faith of the Church as defined to condemn heresy and exclude heretics. The Apostles' Creed is historical, reciting the facts past, present, and future about Jesus Christ, which the Christian believer must assert over-against the denial of heresy. The third article dealing with the virgin-birth, apart altogether from any critical questions which may be raised about the fact, is one to which the personal faith of many Christians to-day attaches no significance. The descent to the lower world has probably quite fallen out of the effective belief of the modern Christian. And if the belief in the Second Coming is still held, it does not exercise the influence over the Christian life which it had in the Apostolic Age. To me it seems that each of these articles does point to an essential element in Christian truth, the absolute sinlessness of Jesus, the complete efficacy of His sacrifice for the salvation of all the generations of men, whatever be the way that the divine grace is brought within the reach of all, and the final triumph of Christ as the consummation of the present order of human history. But we cannot to-day express these truths just as did the generation of believers who confessed their faith in the Apostle's Creed. The doctrines of the trinity, the divinity and the humanity of Christ, the unity of the person, are all distinctive contents of Christian thought; but it cannot surely be maintained that the exact, elaborate metaphysical formulation of these doctrines in the Athanasian Creed can claim permanent and universal authority for Christian faith. Be the metaphysics good or bad, faith lives and works in another region than that of metaphysical abstractions.

(2) The dominant interest of the Nicene symbol is not merely the divinity of Jesus Christ, but, over-against the inadequate Arian representation of that divinity, the divinity as *oneness in substance* of the Son with the Father. In the third section of this article the suitability of the metaphysical formulæ employed will be discussed. Meanwhile from the standpoint of personal faith it may be contended that, however expressed, the truth that God Himself and no other was in Christ saving mankind is essential. The sufficiency and the finality of the Christian salvation is assured only if the work was not accomplished by any creature, but by the Creator Himself as man for man. A vital interest of the Christian religion was at stake in this controversy.

(3) The reality of the manhood of Jesus Christ is an essential truth for Christian faith; but so is the unity of the person of Christ. (i.) The Christian thinker of to-day would treat more tolerantly and even appreciatively the attempt of Apollinaris to make that unity more real than the orthodox doctrine did. His psychology is not ours to-day; we do not distinguish a rational and an animal soul as he did; and our conception of personality allows of an immanence of God as personal in man, which does not suppress the human personality or destroy the unity of the personal experience and character. For us, therefore, the assertion of 'a rational soul' in Christ has lost much of its significance. (ii.) In discussing the metaphysical formulæ of the Chalcedonian symbol, we shall consider the question whether Nestorius was really guilty of the heresy for which he was condemned. At the present stage of our discussion all we are concerned to show is that Christian faith does demand the personal unity of Christ; and that in asserting that unity in opposition to its alleged denial this Creed was safeguarding a vital interest. It must be added, however, that the Creed did nothing to make that unity more concretely real, and so more intelligible to the mind, but rather in its underlying assumption of an essential opposition of divine and human nature, and of the absolute impassibility and immobility of the divine nature, implicitly excluded even the possibility of any such unity. Nestorianism was more logical, given the common assumption, than the Creed. The four 'famous adverbs' employed to describe the distinction of the natures in the unity of the person posit rather than resolve the problem. (iii.) Eutychianism was a greater danger to the Christian faith than Nestorianism; it would have cut off the metaphysical creed altogether from its historical basis in the actual life of Jesus on earth. And yet Eutychianism only carried to its logical conclusion the dominant tendency of the Christian thought of that age. Athanasius spoke of a *ἔνωσις φυσική*. The term *θεοτόκος* applied to Mary the mother of Jesus, which Cyril so vehemently defended against Nestorius, indicates that in the current conception the divinity absorbed the humanity. Many of the Fathers present the same conception. The Creed of Chalcedon did render an invaluable service in insisting, as it did, that the human nature was real, complete, unabsorbed into the divine. An inadequate conception of person-

ality in God and man made the framers of the symbol incapable of thinking the personal unity of both God and man in Christ. It is in the very factors which the creeds ignore in the earthly life of Jesus that the solution of the problem lies; in His moral character and religious consciousness, His

revealing truth and redeeming grace we can discover divine-human personality. It is these moral and religious facts which the creeds pass over on which personal faith to-day lays hold, and to which it closely clings. Both negatively and positively the creeds fail to meet the demand of personal faith.

Literature.

PRINCIPAL SIMON.

THE Rev. Frederick J. Powicke, Ph.D., has written the biography of the late Principal Simon of the United College, Bradford. The title is *David Worthington Simon* (Hodder & Stoughton; 7s. 6d.). It cannot have been an easy thing to do, for Dr. Simon lived a life of the utmost simplicity and quietness. His strength was in his character; but character is the most difficult thing on earth to turn into language. Character, however, has influence; and what Dr. Powicke has done is to gather together the men who came under the influence of Dr. Simon's character and get them to tell what he was to them. These tributes are certainly not all the book. Dr. Powicke himself has written a considerable part of it, and there are many letters, for Dr. Simon was a delightful letter-writer. But the tributes of friends and students are an important element in it. We cannot think of any recent biography in which that element bulks so largely or produces so memorable an impression.

Dr. Massie was Dr. Simon's colleague at Spring Hill College for fifteen years—up to the time of Dr. Simon's appointment to the Principalship of the Theological Hall in Edinburgh. After speaking of the inspiration of saintliness in his character, Dr. Massie says: 'With all this he was a man, and, in the best sense, a natural man: if he had been otherwise he would have belied himself. His nature abhorred cant, that is, according to Hazlitt's definition, not hypocrisy, the pretending to feel what you don't feel at all—that is out of the reckoning—but what truly religious men are often guilty of, overwrought presentation of a feeling which at its root is genuine. "Treacle," as he used often to call it, made him sick, and even inclined him, as he extravagantly put it, to profanity. A luscious spiritual phraseology, or what he termed

"slush," provoked him (in my company, at any rate) to an unrestrained mockery which bubbled out of a keen sense of humour and which would undoubtedly have made a matter-of-fact piety stand with its bristles erect and its mouth wide open. Like our common friend Dale, he shrank from, as unmanly, such ways of speaking of our Lord and Master and Judge as "Dear Jesus," "Sweet Jesus." The truth was that he saw how sentimentality tended to kill true reverence, and to nourish a mawkish and (not womanly but) womanish attitude towards the Son of Man. And that was his and Dale's criticism of the Faber style of hymnology.'

THE MAFULU.

The Mafulu are a mountain people in British New Guinea. They have had a Roman Catholic Mission among them for five years. They have also seen an occasional trader or scientific investigator. But they are really in as uncivilized a state as it is possible now to find a race in any part of the world. And that was the very attraction which drew Mr. Robert W. Williamson to visit them in the year 1910. He went not out of mere curiosity, but out of a desire to increase our knowledge of the mind and manners of the untutored savage; and he went well furnished with those questions which Dr. Frazer has been the chief instrument in preparing for the use of anthropological inquirers. He confesses that the natives did not understand his questions, and when they did, often refused to answer them. And he is very fair in enabling us to distinguish between information and inference. The book which he has written, and to which he has given the simple title of *The Mafulu* (Macmillan; 14s. net), is plentifully illustrated from photographs, many of which were supplied by the Roman Catholic missionaries, who did everything

in their power for the author's personal comfort and for his book.

The book contains nothing that is absolutely new, but it supplies a good many additional examples of this custom and that superstition, confirming some theories and discrediting others. Apart, however, from the actual information which it furnishes, it is a pleasant book to read, unusually pleasant even for a book of exploration, so easy is the writer's narrative and so manifest his sincerity.

On the question of dress, that extremely difficult and sometimes delicate question, Mr. Williamson evidently inclines to the opinion that it has nothing whatever to do with the relation of the sexes. Its origin is not in the feeling of shame, nor is its use due to any emotion of modesty. It is a surprise to find that infant betrothal is common among a people who have so little ceremony and so little regard for the ties of marriage. Mr. Williamson mentions one case, of which he knew for a fact, in which a girl of fifteen or sixteen years of age was betrothed to the unborn son of a chief, and the price of the betrothal actually paid. When the boy was born (how did they know it would be a boy?) and died in infancy, the girl was henceforth regarded as a widow. Sentimental people will be pleased to learn that a young man speaks of his sweetheart as his *ofande*, which means his flower. When a boy wants to marry, and does not know where to seek a wife, he sometimes lights a fire in the bush and then goes off in the direction in which the wind blows the flame. In the first village he arrives at he seeks and usually finds his wife.

INDIVIDUALITY AND VALUE.

The Gifford Lectures in Edinburgh University for 1911 were delivered by Mr. Bernard Bosanquet, LL.D., D.C.L. They are now published by Messrs. Macmillan under the title of *The Principle of Individuality and Value* (10s. net).

It may be said sweepingly that Mr. Bosanquet's Gifford Lectures were delivered for the purpose of telling us what philosophy has done for us. He believes that there is a good deal of rubbish still uttered in the name of philosophy, but that it can be got rid of. When it is got rid of, and the sooner it is got rid of the better, certain things which were once theory can be claimed as fact. It is our business to claim them as fact, to stand

confidently upon them, and from that firm footing to go forward.

Is it possible, then, to say shortly what these philosophical facts are? They can be expressed in a single word. That word is Individuality. Of course Individuality is a large word. It is to be defined in opposition to some things and in conformity with others, and it may be said, though again somewhat sweepingly, that Mr. Bosanquet's Gifford Lectures are there to tell us what is meant by Individuality.

There are moments when the lecturer seems to say that Individuality is simply a synonym for Spirituality. But if he said that, he would be most careful to point out that Spirituality is not the annihilation of the 'outward,' but its transfiguration in the total life. There are other moments when he seems to allow Individuality to be swallowed up in the idea of the Absolute. But again he is careful to maintain that while we may and must be included in the Absolute, which is greater than ourselves, we nevertheless are ourselves and in the Absolute both gain and retain our Individuality. For with Mr. Bernard Bosanquet the Absolute is not altogether distinguishable from God, a God who may be known, revered and loved. But the distinction between the Absolute and God, if there is any, is to be the subject of the second course of lectures, the course for 1912.

SCHAFF-HERZOG.

Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have published the last volume of *The New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge* (21s. net). It is the thickest volume of the twelve, containing nearly 600 pages, for it not only completes the alphabet, but runs over it all again, and fills in the omissions that have occurred in any of the volumes. These omissions are given in an Appendix of fifty pages.

It is interesting to observe that one of the omissions is Bergson, and another Eucken. So these men had not risen above the horizon even so recently as the issue of the early volumes of this work! But surely Mary Baker Eddy was known then, yet here she is in the Appendix. The short article on her life and work has been written by a Christian Scientist, which is certainly as it ought to be. There is also an article under the title of 'Psychotherapy and Christian Science' written from the same standpoint.

The longest article in the Appendix appears under the title 'Monophysitism and the Oriental Separated Churches.' It is signed by Dr. Ernest C. Margrander, Chancellor to the Orthodox Catholic Archbishop of America.

In the body of this volume there is an article on 'Union of the Churches.' It is divided into four parts. First there is a statement of the Anglican position by Dr. Francis J. Hall, which is followed by a note on Anglo-Swedish Negotiations. Next the Orthodox Catholic position is described by Chancellor Margrander. This is succeeded by an account of the Protestant position by Dr. Newman Smyth. The last part is occupied with a short exposition of the Roman Catholic position, written by Dr. J. F. Driscoll. The editors say that an article from the Græco-Russian standpoint was arranged for but indefinitely delayed. They add that it may appear later. A supplement by one of the editors points out that a wide union is impossible unless either the episcopally ordained are willing to include non-episcopal communions without reordination (which at present they are not), or non-episcopal ministers are willing to say that their ordinations are invalid (which again 'at present they are not'). The whole matter is resolved into that compact but inextricable deadlock.

A volume of the 'Guild Library' has been given to *Literature and Life* (A. & C. Black; 1s. 6d. net). The author is the Rev. Lauchlan Maclean Watt, M.A., B.D. The title is world-embracing; but Mr. Watt has a definite purpose before him in the writing of the book, which he states in this way. It 'is intended,' he says, 'to interest young men and women in the spiritual principles which underlie true Literature, and to give them a bias in the direction of these, as exhibited in the great writers. It is meant to be an incentive to wider reading, and to the deepening of acquaintance with books.' The volume is accordingly divided into two parts. The first part tells us what distinguishes literature from writing that is not literature; the second part shows us how that distinction is maintained throughout the Bible, Shakespeare, and other great books. It is the editors' object, we understand, by means of the 'Guild Library,' to make life larger and fuller all round. There could have been no hesitation, therefore, in accepting Mr. Watt's book. Moreover, there is true religion in

it, more than in many books which are sprinkled more freely with the name of God.

In his *Types of English Piety* (T. & T. Clark; 4s. net) the Rev. R. H. Coats, M.A., B.D., has succeeded in being both elementary and profound. And both at the same time. Not only so, but he is Johannine also in the transparent unconsciousness of his style. The impression which his book makes is that he has studied the subject of English piety for a long time, until the essential things have become very clear to his mind; and the language has been fitly chosen. Moreover, the book is a product of this present time. We are not less ardent sacerdotalists, evangelicals, or mystics than our fathers were, but we are less fiercely so. Even the sacerdotalist can see good in evangelicalism and in mysticism, and regret that he cannot attain to it. Mr. Coats is no latitudinarian; he has not hidden from us his preference in the types of piety. But he has risen sufficiently above their limitations to give us a picture of all three which will remain with us for ever. The best of the book is that we are confirmed by it in the value of our own type of piety and made more watchful than ever against its perversion.

An author's greatness depends upon what he writes, his popularity upon what is written about him. One here and there, curious and studious, read Eucken and read Bergson, and when they made their discoveries known the world applauded. Now the danger is that Eucken and Bergson may have their popularity buried under too much commentary. But that time is not yet. And Mr. E. Hermann's book, called *Eucken and Bergson: Their Significance for Christian Thought* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net), will still be serviceable. Hermann draws most unmistakably to Eucken. Bergson is not yet constructive enough for confidence. But both Eucken and Bergson are a long way from that knowledge of God in the face of Jesus Christ which we hope they will come to. Mr. Hermann is one of the easiest and most immediately useful, at least for the preacher, of all the commentators.

The lecturer is disappearing. Even in America, they say, where once he was able to make business men forget their luncheon hour, he is passing away. Has the magazine displaced him? Surely

an article that can be read would gain tenfold force if it were uttered. But it depends on the utterance. Many men can write, very few are the men who can speak.

Of the few Dr. S. Parkes Cadman is one. His lectures, of which he has published seven (delivered at the Brooklyn Institute of Arts and Sciences in 1910) in a volume entitled *Charles Darwin and other English Thinkers* (James Clarke & Co.; 5s. net) are pleasant to read, and evidently were quite impressive to hear. They have lost good deal in the printing, but they still retain certain personality and quiet charm. And if we are in danger of forgetting what manner of men these were—Darwin, Huxley, Mill, Martineau, and Matthew Arnold—and what they accomplished, Dr. Cadman's lectures will recover much of it for us.

The Rev. William Souper, M.A., of Clapham, has issued an 'Introduction to Christian Thought' under the title of *Constructive Christianity* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). He believes that a fierce struggle is going on between nature and spirit for the possession of the mind of man. For some time nature has had the best of it, the advantage being gained when Darwin published his *Origin of Species*. But great thinkers have come to the aid of the spirit, and Mr. Souper would do all in his power to cheer them on. For the supremacy of nature at its highest is culture, and culture is selfishness; but the supremacy of the spirit is love. Mr. Souper in his argument finds himself very soon commending Christ. For Christ he finds not only the example of unselfish love but also the instrument of its prevailing power in society. His book is the modern *Home and See*.

The Rev. W. Charter Piggott has published nineteen sermons, after stripping them of their texts and otherwise giving them the look of essays, and has called his book *The Imperishable Word* (James Clarke & Co.; 2s. 6d. net). He himself tells us that they are sermons, and that he has transformed them into essays; he does not tell us why. Do essays sell better than sermons? We hope not. Mr. Piggott's sermons would have sold as readily as sermons.

Messrs. James Clarke & Co. have sent out all

at once several good books this spring, but they have issued nothing better than *Problems and Perplexities*, by the Rev. W. E. Orchard, D.D., though it is the smallest of them all (2s. 6d. net). It is the smallest, but it is full of matter. Dr. Orchard fills a column or more of the *Christian Commonwealth* every week with answers to correspondents. These are the most valuable of the answers.

It is claimed by Mr. Robert Hugh Benson, who writes the preface, that a book entitled *The Mustard Tree* (Duckworth; 5s. net) introduces a new method in apologetic. The old method, he says, was to prove the divinity of Christ, and from that to deduce the infallibility of the Church. The new method is to point to the facts that are before men's eyes,—the facts, for example, of the Unity of the Church, the intense faith of Catholics in the Eucharist, the devotion to Mary,—and from these facts to work back to the Divinity. In any case, that is the method of apologetic pursued in *The Mustard Tree*, which is written by Mr. O. R. Vassall-Phillips. There is an Epilogue by Mr. Hilaire Belloc, which is a clever résumé of the whole argument which the book contains.

'One need be no specialist in sociology to discern the chief "note" of social change during the modern epoch. The main economic phenomenon of the nineteenth century was the rise of the great working class, joint product of the political and of the industrial revolution. The main fact of the twentieth century is bound to be the advance of this class into conscious power.'

Accordingly Vida D. Scudder writes a book on *Socialism and Character* (Dent; 5s. net) to guide the great working class to a right use of their power. Notice that word 'character' in the title. If that word gets its place and influence in the life of the working class, the power will not be abused. But in order that character may be formed, and may tell, it is necessary that there be some recognition of duty as well as some claim of right; it is necessary, indeed, that duty be felt as the impress of an authority which cannot be disputed. Thus the book makes the demand for an authority that can be recognized as authoritative and may be unhesitatingly obeyed. The authority of superior numbers is tyranny; it is in the end the selfish assertion of each man's own will, and there-

fore the removal of all authority. Where, then, will the universally acknowledged and universally beneficent authority be found? The answer is the one word God. 'God wills it'—when that is heard, as we now understand God, when that is obeyed, the power of the great working class will be a gift of utmost good to the world. It is an opportunity for the Christian preacher.

We have received from Mr. Francis Griffiths Parts 55 to 64 of *The Churchman's Pulpit*. These include sermons for Epiphany Sunday and for the Sundays following Epiphany as far as Quinquagesima Sunday. The part for Epiphany is a special number, and costs 5s. net; the other parts are published at 1s. 6d. net.

We have also received certain parts of a distinct work called *The Children's Pulpit*. This work is further described as 'a comprehensive library of religious and moral instruction for the use of preachers and teachers in the preparation of sermons and lessons to the young.' Beginning with the first Sunday in Advent, five parts carry us on to Christmas Day and complete the first volume. These seem to be all that are yet issued, but four parts are issued of a separate series of sermons for children. It goes under the same general title of *The Children's Pulpit*, but has a sub-title 'Boys and Girls of the Old Testament.' One of these parts is a double number, and is published at 2s. 6d. net, the rest are published at 1s. net each.

Thirdly, the first number has been published of a series entitled *The Lecture Library* (1s. 6d. net). This part contains a biography of John Wesley by Mr. G. Herbert Bloye. The purpose of this series is to provide material and assistance for those who deliver lectures or write papers. Each lecture is to be complete in itself, and is to provide 'in concise and ready fashion the most thorough, reliable, and up-to-date information on the subject to which it refers.' It will also contain a list of works for further reference.

Last of all, and most important, we have received two volumes of *The Expositor's Library*. One of the volumes contains sermons on the first sixteen Psalms, the other contains sermons on the first five chapters of St. Matthew. These two volumes are nicely bound in cloth. They contain about 450 pages, and are published at 9s. net each.

All these works are edited by one and the same editor, the Rev. John Henry Burn, B.D. Mr.

Burn first made his name known as the compiler of the 'Biblical Illustrator.' It is true that that work went under the name of the Rev. J. S. Exell, but it is quite well known that the work was done by Mr. Burn. The mass of material gathered into that book is simply astounding. Yet it was only the beginning of enterprise with Mr. Burn. The amount of sermon material which he is now pouring out takes one's breath away. They may say what they will about the decay of the pulpit in power. If it consumes this vast quantity of sermon material there must be a good deal of vitality in it yet.

The *Titanic* tragedy gives unexpected force to the question which is chosen as the title of Dr. Frank Ballard's new book, *Why does not God Intervene?* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). It is the question which many uninstructed persons have been asking these weeks past, and some very bitterly. There is no short and easy answer. The shortest and easiest, to be in agreement with the truth, is to be found just in Dr. Ballard's book. And in that book he answers other questions of perplexed humanity—Does the mystery of Pain contradict the love of God?—What is there in God to fear?—What is it to 'be saved'?—How does the Bible stand to-day?—Are the Churches helping the modern appreciation of the Bible?—Is there any Hereafter?—What is the Christian Doctrine of Immortality?—What are Christian Churches worth to the modern world?—What is the Revival most needed in Christendom?

Epitaphs have been gathered plentifully. Why not Dedications? If any man wants work this is an almost uncultivated corner. Among the dedications that are brief and business-like place Mr. Harold Begbie's dedication of his new book, *The Ordinary Man and the Extraordinary Thing* (Hodder & Stoughton; 6s.). It is dedicated 'To my friend Percy L. Parker, Editor of the *Indispensable Review*, "Public Opinion."'

Mr. Begbie's new book is a corrective. Did we understand from *Broken Earthenware* and the rest that Mr. Begbie believed only in sudden conversions? He corrects our mistake. This book is written to make known his belief that 'conversion is not generally a sudden and catastrophic experience, but for most men a gradual and imperceptible process of development.' M.

Begbie is as serious as ever; here, however, he is less theological than usual.

The best account of Bahaism is that which has been contributed by Professor Browne of Cambridge to the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*. But a popular account, sufficient for most men, will be found in a small book entitled *Bahaism, the Religion of Brotherhood*, which has been written by Mr. Francis Henry Skrine, F.R.Hist.S. (Longmans; 1s. 6d.).

Messrs. Macmillan have added to their 'New Shilling Library,' Dean Farrar's *Eternal Hope*. Will the railway traveller take it off the bookstall? There is both Greek and Hebrew in it. But then there is a frank discourse of the meaning of the word 'Hell.'

There are three theories about the origin and nature of our universe which we now meet every day. There is the Materialistic hypothesis—that all things mechanically evolve and are mere combinations of matter. There is the Psychic hypothesis—that spirit, potential in matter, has been the formative principle, and will become more and more dominant. And there is the God hypothesis. And the author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia* has written a book for the purpose of proving that the God hypothesis is the only true one. He has given it the title of *Voluntas Dei* (Macmillan; 5s. net). In order to demonstrate to us that the God hypothesis is the only true one, so as to convince us of it, he has had to show us what the God hypothesis is. In other words, his book is written to tell us who God is, and what He has done for the world. What has He done for the world? He has created it, and He has redeemed it. And both these works are past. So that now we have to recognize that this world has come into existence through the will of God, and must therefore express the character of God; and secondly, that it has been redeemed from its own wilfulness by the will of God, and the men and women in the world must therefore recognize that the redemption is accomplished, and in great gladness of heart conform themselves thereto. In great gladness, we say. This is the subject of the last chapter. Why should we be glad? Simply because the Creator and Redeemer has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows; and what He has borne we do not need to carry also.

We have hitherto had to pay so exorbitantly for a good copy of Shelley's prose works that we rejoice to know that *The Prose Works of Percy Bysshe Shelley* may now be bought in a beautiful and comfortable two-volume edition for four shillings net in cloth, or six shillings net in leather. It is an addition made by Messrs. Chatto & Windus to their 'St. Martin's Library.'

The Rev. George D. Low, M.A., of East Wemyss, may live to repent of having published a volume of sermons so early in his ministry. For what will he do for want of them when by their own power and popularity he is called to a great city charge? It must be admitted that they are not conspicuously the sermons of a young man. They are grouped as Prophetic, Evangelic, and Pauline, according as the texts are taken from the Old Testament, the Gospels, or the Epistle of St. Paul. The Prophetic are the most instructive, because there Mr. Low is able to use with most effect that historical method which has been so much to him, and in which he takes such delight. It is in the Old Testament that the historical method has won its most conspicuous triumphs. The title of the volume is *The New Heart* (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net).

While others are trying to prove that the Lord is worth glorying in, or even that there is a Lord to glory in, the Rev. James Little, A.M., of Belfast, is glorying in the Lord. Under the title of *Glorying in the Lord*, he issues a volume of sermons (Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier; 3s. 6d. net) which will be called old-fashioned by the undiscerning, but which are really in the very latest fashion and the best. For we are coming back to the certainties again. All our criticism and discussion has ended in this—we see now and know that Jesus is the Living One, that He died, and that He is alive for ever and has the keys of death and of Hades. Mr. Little appears never to have doubted it. This is the preaching that prevails.

Sir Thomas Acland has written a preface to a small book on *The True Greatness of Paul the Apostle*, by Mr. L. S. Alban Wells, M.A. (Knaresborough: Parr; 1s. net). He commends the book for two reasons: first because it is short, and next because it is unprejudiced. Both

reasons are true and good. The shortness is not superficiality, and the absence of prejudice is not absence of interest, but deliberate determination on the author's part to see for himself and say only what he sees.

The book entitled *Christian and Mohammedan* (Revell; 5s. net), by the Rev. George F. Herrick, has been written expressly for the instruction of missionaries to Muslims. Its greatest service will be to instruct them in the spirit with which they should approach the Muhammadan. But at the same time it fulfils the purpose of informing the followers of Christ everywhere of two things about Muhammadanism, its present position in the world and the fundamental differences between it and Christianity. Mr. Herrick begs the missionary to deal gently with the Muhammadan; but he warns him to give no quarter to Muhammadanism. Much of the value of the book lies in its breadth of view. This is due to the fact that the author has been able to use the answers which missionaries to Muslims sent in reply to questions addressed to them. These answers came from forty-three missionaries. They came from every corner to which the Prophet has penetrated; they came even from England, for one of the correspondents is Professor Margoliouth of Oxford.

The Rev. G. W. Bull, D.D., of the First Presbyterian Church, Scranton, Pa., dissatisfied, we suppose, with the traditional commentary, has hit upon a method of expounding Scripture which may become useful. In Dr. Bull's hands it does not yield the best results: he is too anxious to be original. His method is to take a verse at a time and give its contents in a short paragraph. He is thus able to combine the verbal commentary with the continuous exposition, and even to add a touch of exhortation when desirable. In this way he has gone over St. John's Gospel. The title of his book is *Daily Reminders from the Gospel of John* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net).

It is generally known, and it is sometimes deeply lamented, that Britain is far behind America in scientific Sunday School work. Those who wish to understand what an American Sunday School is, and what is the work that is done in it, should order a copy of *The Sunday School of To-day*, by the Rev. W. Walter Smith, M.D.

(Revell; 3s. 6d. net). It contains the architect plans for building a Sunday School, the arrangement (in grades) of the classes, the management (organization) of it, the methods of teaching and of training teachers, and a list of books on each of these subjects for fuller study.

The great problem in some churches is how to get the children to enter; in others it is what to do with them after they are in. The children's sermon is not sufficient, and it is not always satisfactory. The whole problem is discussed in a book written by the Rev. Henry Woodward Hulbert, D.D., and entitled *The Church and the Children* (Revell; 3s. 6d. net). The point of view is American, and that is well. For only in America is there perfect freedom of discussion, and only there have all the phases of the problem been studied. They have been studied, and they have also been experimented with in America; so that now it is in our power, by the reading of this engaging volume, to take what is applicable and likely to work with us and leave the rest alone.

'Friendship has seven sovereign elements: Truth, Purity, Sympathy, Personality, Spirituality, Self-giving, and Immortality.' So says Professor Robert Wells Veach, D.D., of New York. He says further that all these elements are found in Jesus, and will at last be found in every follower of Jesus. He accordingly writes a book on *The Friendship of Jesus: The Secret of a Victorious Life* (Revell; 2s. 6d. net).

In the sad story of the sinking of the *Titanic* we are told that there came a moment when the captain of the ship called to every man to look out for himself. There is a ship called Human Life. It has many self-appointed captains who are simply saying to every man to look out for himself. One of them is Mr. Ernest Belfort Bax. Mr. Bax has gathered together a number of essays and magazine articles, and published them under the title of *Problems of Men, Mind, and Morals* (Grant Richards; 6s. net). From first to last it is an argument against the existence of authority; it is an encouragement to every man to do what he thinks is right in his own eyes. The captain of the *Titanic* did not issue his order until, as he believed, the women and children were out of the way. Mr. Bax does not trouble about the women

or the children. He has a chapter on 'The Problem of Alcohol.' The man may drink as much as he pleases. Mr. Bax does not ask that first of all the children should be saved. This is how he deals with the argument from example. 'Preachers of this doctrine forget that to be consistent they must give it a wider application than the alcohol question. For instance, I am recovering from a broken leg, or suffering from phlebitis, varicose veins, or some other malady, for which exercise is a bad thing; my inclinations, nevertheless, are to move about and thereby injure myself. It follows, therefore, that my healthy but high-souled neighbours, those with whom I am thrown in contact, ought to forego all walking exercise in order to set an example to me not to injure myself by the same.'

He has another chapter on 'The Problem of Sex and Sentiment.' Here he says that, 'however estimable the current sexual theory of Christendom may be, mechanical monogamy must be definitely abandoned, and freedom of choice, within at least certain limits, granted as just and righteous.'

The Rev. the Hon. Edward Lyttelton, M.A., B.D., Headmaster of Eton College, has written a book for the purpose of recommending the virtue of Humility. He believes that in that virtue is found the heart and soul of true Christianity. The man who lacks humility is not a Christian; and if he is not a Christian he is a very misshapen man. But where is Humility to be found? Nowhere but in a whole-hearted belief in Christ as God, and a whole-hearted acceptance of Christ as a redeemer. The book takes the shape of a series of dialogues between B and certain others, namely, a conscientious man who is called A, a theist called C, an orthodox Christian called D, and E, who sets B and all the rest right. After a year B himself is able to 'instruct others also,' and does instruct F. The argument being ended, three discussions follow, one on the Teaching and Example of Christ, one on the Influence of Greek Philosophy, and one on some Difficulties in Prayer.

The volume is called *Character and Religion* (Robert Scott; 5s. net).

The new book which Mr. A. C. Benson has written—he calls it *The Child of the Dawn* (Smith, Elder & Co.; 7s. 6d. net)—is a book to make one

think. 'Philip was one of the most beautiful of all the spirits I ever came near. His last life upon earth had been a long one, and he had been a teacher. I used to tell him that I wished I had been under him as a pupil, to which he replied, laughing, that I should have found him very uninteresting. He said to me once that the way he had always distinguished the two kinds of teachers on earth had been by whether they were always anxious to teach new books and new subjects, or went on contentedly with the old. "The pleasure," he said, "was in the teaching, in making the thought clear, in tempting the boys to find out what they knew all the time; and the oftener I taught a subject the better I liked it; it was like a big cog-wheel, with a number of little cog-wheels turning with it. But the men who were always wanting to change their subjects were the men who thought of their own intellectual interest first, and very little of the small interests revolving upon it." The charm of Philip was the charm of extreme ingenuousness combined with daring insight. He never seemed to be shocked or distressed by anything. He said one day, "It was not the sensual or the timid or the ill-tempered boys who used to make me anxious. Those were definite faults and brought definite punishment; it was the hard-hearted, virtuous, ambitious, sensible boys, who were good-humoured and respectable and selfish, who bothered me; one wanted to shake them as a terrier shakes a rat—but there was nothing to get hold of. They were a credit to themselves and to their parents and to the school; and yet they went downhill with every success.'

We cannot dismiss that as untrue or even exaggerated, however we may be disturbed by it; and it is the theme of the book. The great evil in the life of men, says Mr. Benson, is to be in a position of influence or authority so that they censure others. Our minds leap immediately to the Pharisees. For, once in the history of the world the man in authority did censure so unmercifully as to make himself a by-word for ever; and we see that the Pharisee himself suffered more than his victims. This is Mr. Benson's argument. The worst evil is not the evil that is done to others by the censorious; it is the evil that is done by the censorious to themselves. Never before was the spirit of the Pharisees treated so gently as it is in this book. Never before was the calamity of it so appallingly revealed.

Mrs. A. J. Penny was a student of Böhme for about forty years of her life, and an expositor of the same for at least thirty years. She wrote no books but many magazine articles. Now these articles, contributed either to 'Light' or to 'Light and Life,' together with one article contributed to the 'New Church Independent' of Chicago, have been republished in volume form under the title of *Studies in Jacob Böhme* (Watkins; 6s. net). They make a large and handsome octavo, for there are nine-and-thirty of them, and some are of considerable length.

The resolution to issue Mrs. Penny's articles in this way was wisely taken. There are few ex-

positors of Böhme, almost shamefully few, and even if they had been ten times as numerous as they are, Mrs. Penny would have taken a place among them. So few are they that the editor of this work can name for the use of the student only the article by Mr. G. W. Allen in the *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*, some papers by the same author in the *Seeker*, and Dr. Whyte's monograph entitled *Jacob Behmen, an Appreciation*.

Does the preacher who has not yet discovered Böhme doubt of his practical worth? Let him read the chapter in this book on 'The Doctrine of Vicarious Suffering.'

The Pilgrim's Progress.

BY THE REV. JOHN KELMAN, D.D., EDINBURGH.

The Second Part.

The Characters.

IN this part Christiana and Mercy recede somewhat into the background. Mercy finds the Valley of Humiliation congenial, and Christiana shows a fine sympathy with Mr. Fearing, which includes the confession, so true to human nature, that 'she had thought nobody was like her.' That short sentence sums up many volumes of doleful Christian experience. The loneliness of depression is one of its worst elements. Escape from sin comes when we realize that we are only bearing the common lot.

The boys sustain their parts. Matthew has much humility to learn, and much pertness to unlearn. Samuel is a boy who thinks out things, slow but sure. James is irresponsible and old-fashioned and lovable as ever, with his 'No fears, no grace'—a phrase which reminds us absurdly of James' royal namesake and his 'No bishop, no king.'

Honest is a splendid piece of portraiture. He is Old Honest, or Father Honest, representative of the bed-rock virtues. It is a vivid scene in which we meet him first, asleep beneath an oak (surely the very tree for Honest to shelter under!), with his clothes and his staff and his girdle all befitting

pilgrimage. He is suspicious and defiant at the first awaking, and has no polite address for unknown folk. Had they been enemies he would have fought as long as breath was in him. And his view of the issue is simple—'he would have won, for a Christian is invincible.'

There is a touch of real genius in his disclaiming the name of 'Honesty' and claiming not to be Honest in*the abstract but only Honest in the particular; and there is a touch of far more than genius in his being reluctant to tell his name, but confessing that his town had been Stupidity. 'Stupidity is a worse place than Destruction itself; further off from the sun,' says he. And in this we find another of those instances of far insight which are so frequent in John Bunyan. Just as uneducated Mercy is dangerous, as we have seen, so uneducated Honesty is clownish, and indeed further from salvation than the less consistent and more impressionable City of Destruction. There is a word here for the wise regarding present-day reversals of old moral ideals. Certain popular novelists and playwrights are for ever canonizing Honesty as the one all-covering and all-atoning virtue. It would seem that so long as a man will but truly speak out what is in his mind, it does not matter how dangerous or

even brutal a thing it may happen to be. If Bunyan were speaking of such honesty he could not find a more clever description of it than just this, 'It lieth about four leagues beyond the City of Destruction.'

Honesty, however, has the stuff in him of the best kind of manhood. We find him certainly one of the most suggestive and interesting of all our characters. His longer speeches, indeed, tend to platitude, but his descriptions of Fearing and Self-will are most vital pieces of literature. He is a plain blunt man with little or no imagination, but, as he tells us, experience of many kinds of men. He goes straight to the point, and most of what he says is memorable.

Mr. Fearing.

Mr. Fearing is known to us only by the account given of him by Honest. The main point about him at first sight is that he is 'troublesome.' It is a world in which we all need our courage, and every timid man who will not face his troubles without revealing his fears is an unwarrantable nuisance to other pilgrims. The type of timidity which Mr. Fearing stands for is a peculiarly interesting one. He is endowed with a singular amount of physical and moral courage, but almost destitute of what we may call spiritual courage. He made no stick at the Hill Difficulty, nor did he fear the lions. He went down the Valley of Humiliation so well that it was evident there was sympathy between that Valley and him. He would lie down and kiss the flowers there and be up by break of day for it. In Vanity Fair he would have fought with everybody, so that even Great-heart confesses that he was afraid they would all have been knocked upon the head. On the Enchanted Ground he was wakeful, and indeed in such matters as these he seems to have outdone even the champion in courage. On the other hand, he was in a state of chronic terror about himself and his spiritual condition and final salvation. He lay roaring at the Slough of Despond for long, and Bunyan, playing with the idea of the allegory, knows that he had a Slough of Despond in his own mind. He stood long at the gate of Good-will seeing other people go in but feeling himself unworthy, and at last Good-will had to step out for him if he were to get in at all. Similarly he lay outside the Interpreter's door with

water in his eyes, until Great-heart saw him from a window and had hard work to entreat him to enter. When he saw three men hanged by the wayside he immediately thought that he would be hanged in course of time. Similarly, at the House Beautiful, though the nights were long and cold, he was got in almost before he was willing. In the Valley of the Shadow of Death, although things were specially quiet there, yet he was continually crying out that the hobgoblins would have him. Finally, when he came to the River, he was sure that he would be 'drowned for ever,' and it almost surprises us that he managed to end with the brief words, 'I shall, I shall.' Such natures are particularly trying to strong and courageous people. We have all our own dangers to face and our constant risks to run, and it is apt to irritate us when we see a fellow-pilgrim subjective and self-conscious, as if it mattered more what happened to himself than to all the other pilgrims on the road. In all epidemics there are certain people who cannot realize the widespread misery for the nervous presentiment of their own probable illness and death. Such people are not only poor company, loving to be alone, but they are very provoking. If it be pled that after all they are the worst sufferers, from their unfortunate disposition, one is very much tempted to reply, that they deserve all they get. Nobody is of so much importance as to justify this kind of pusillanimity.

In view of all this there is nothing so striking in the whole allegory as the tenderness with which this troublesome and disagreeable character is treated. Great-heart's tenderness with him is one of Bunyan's finest passages, and the quiet humour that runs through it all only reveals more plainly the great sympathy and gentleness within. Great-heart, indeed, can very well bear with such a troublesome one, for he is well accustomed to them. The Lord at the Interpreter's House carries it very lovingly towards Fearing, and gives him many tit-bits, 'for my master, you must know, is one of very tender compassion, especially to them that are afraid.' The Lord had quieted the Shadow of Death specially for him, and had actually held in check the hobgoblins of which he was in such terror. The explanation must be that, in this particular instance, spiritual cowardice springs from a very great tenderness about sin, a scrupulous and burdened conscience. While

it is true that 'folly and fear are sisters twain,' yet it is also true that the fear of the Lord is the beginning of wisdom; and still less than Bunyan can we afford to lose any instance of a sensitive conscience, however crude and exaggerated it may be.

This is one explanation of Great-heart's kindness to him. In the Puritan mind there was a great trust in conscience, and any man whose fear sprang from that source was congenial and honoured. But another reason for Great-heart's kindness is that, as Renan says, 'No one is so tender as the austere man.' The truly strong man knows, as no one else can know, how great the strain has been. Like the Herakles in Browning's *Balaustion's Adventure*:

'So long as men were only weak, not bad,
He loved men.

So Great-heart passes, in one of the finest passages in the book, into a discourse about Fearing. At the worst it had been the weakness of his mind that made him liable to annoyance from the 'things that were his troublers,' and not weakness either of conscience or of spirit. The whole-hearted rashness of Fearing in Vanity Fair, while it endangered Great-heart's head, had strongly enlisted his sympathy; so in this musing he falls into that curiously exquisite passage about the music of life, and the bass as the ground of all music. It is a word to all wise optimists, and a true and memorable one. To ignore sorrow and danger is no true courage. To see the sad side of life and to realize the tremendous powers of evil and of sorrow is indeed the beginning, not only of wisdom, but of all courage worth the name.

Self-will.

Self-will is the other character discussed by Mr. Honest—the 'High Bass' contrasting with Fearing's 'Low Bass.' He was a man who never came in at the gate, and who was a law unto himself all through, caring neither for man, argument, nor example. He represents that antinomian type which has been curiously associated with pilgrimages all through time. It is notorious that in the Crusades, the vices as well as the virtues of pilgrims were let loose upon the world. One may see the same fact in the conversation of Chaucer's *Canterbury Pilgrims*, and at this day

there is an Arab saying in regard to the Mecca Pilgrimage of the Haj: 'If a man has been to Mecca once, be careful; if he has been twice, cut him dead.' For all such people, the main thing is to be a pilgrim, not to be a good man—pilgrimage standing instead of all the other virtues. Self-will backed his opinions by Scripture, quoting freely such names as David, Solomon, and Sarah. He would have been better of a little of the Higher Criticism, had that been known in his day, to give him a sense of the development of moral conceptions, and to assure him that all Scripture is not given for our following the example of the lives recorded in it. Yet even upon the old lines it might have occurred to him that while David was a great sinner he was also a great repentant—a distinction not without a difference.

The distinction here drawn is between sins of infirmity and sins of presumption; between the child who falls down, blown over by a blast of wind, and him who wallows in the mire like a boar blinded by the power of lust. The point that he raises is this, that if you have the virtues of pilgrims you may have their vices, and they will not be accounted against you. If you are a David you may commit adultery, and so on. The immediate allusion is doubtless to the Ranters, those wild Antinomians of the seventeenth century; and the list of opinions such as, 'it is time enough to repent when you come to die,' is doubtless borrowed from them. It is a very subtle and persistent illusion and danger. The whole moral of Goethe's *Faust* is just this, that a man is safe as long as he strives against his sin, however much he commits; but that to settle down in sin and be satisfied with what Mephistopheles can give you is the final and only damnation. As to the other point which Self-will raises, it is one which recurs continually in such biographies as those of Nelson and of Wellington. It is extremely difficult, in judging others, not to allow their supreme services to the State, or their otherwise lovable character, to entirely excuse any private vices which they may have cherished. The reply is that, after all, we have little to do with the judgment of other men, but that in judging ourselves one thing must be kept absolutely clear. Vice is vice, and sin is sin, and must be judged as if it were the only quality of the life, and not in connexion with other condoning and compensating characteristics. Virtue is a

seamless robe, and to break one commandment is to break the whole of the law, to nullify the effect of character.

What is the sorriest thing that enters Hell?
None of the sins,—but this or that fair deed
Which a soul's sin at length could supersede.¹

Honest's remark about Self-will is significant. 'Why,' says Self-will, 'to do this by way of opinion, seems abundant more honest than to do it and hold contrary to it in opinion.' Here is the opposite doctrine from that of Faust justified on a plea of honesty. Honesty, in fact, has become a devilish habit of calling a spade a spade, and then asking no question as to whether you may not be digging with it your own grave or some other man's. It is not enough that it should be a spade. It is demanded that it should be a spade used for right ends. But this false honesty which prefers bluff to failure in every case, then and now has a habit of whitewashing vices and imagining that by honestly so doing it has changed them into virtues. If Mr. Fearing played upon the bass and found it the ground of all music, here is a man whose ground is the treble of the Venusberg, which is ultimately the ground of all discord.

Great-heart.

In this whole passage the hero appears in a more genial light, letting himself go freely, with a frequent gleam of good-humour and even of banter. It seems to be in the company of his own sex that he thaws and shows his more natural side. There is a great deal of subtlety in the portraiture of this character, and it is notable that while he is very much pleased with Honest's sage counsels to Matthew and the rest, he never talks like that himself. The conventional platitudes of religion were the proper thing to be pleased with, and neither Great-heart nor Bunyan enters any protest against them; but when they are free to talk their own language it is seldom conventional.

The joy that hailed Great-heart's coming, and indeed the whole passage, presents an interesting parallel to the wonderful story of Herakles in *Balaustion's Adventure*. His type of religiousness is deep, and yet broadly human; and his saying about Christian is characteristic of himself,—Christian 'was beloved of his God; and also he had a good heart of his own.' He is essentially a

fighting man, who loves to look upon the 'bright face of danger' and enjoys a brisk encounter. He reminds us of Captain Good's saying in Africa, 'That a row is good at any time.' Like all true fighting men he is always on the alert, looking well to his feet. He has learned from Luther a certain braggadocio of faith, and 'is not afraid of all the Satans in Hell.' He is a sort of Oliver Cromwell as he sings, 'Until that I, Great-heart, arise, the pilgrims guide to be,' etc. He is a sort of Philip Sidney in his chivalrous fair play to Maul, when he lets him get up that he may be refreshed before he fight him again. His tenderness to all faults is most touching, as we have seen in regard to Fearing. As to Christian, he explains his failures in the Valley of Humiliation, 'but we will leave the good man, he is at rest, he also had a brave victory over his enemy; let Him that dwelleth above grant that we fare no worse, when we come to be tried, than he.'

It is as a man of experience that Great-heart impresses us most of all. There is a splash of his own blood upon him at all times. He is personally with us, and takes us into confidence about his own life. He also, like Fearing, finds the Valley of Humiliation congenial, for he has found that the only real greatness comes through Humiliation. Nor is his experience kept merely for his own ruminations, still less for boasting. It is to comfort others that he says, 'I have often gone through this Valley,' the Valley where a man has to pray and fight at the same time. As to the end, his is too simple a nature for modern subtleties about duty for duty's sake, and he frankly hopes for a reward at last.

His humanness and humility are, however, not a matter merely of disposition. Duty is the bottom rock of life for Great-heart, and even these interesting and attractive temperaments are due to a sense of it. 'It is my duty,' said he, 'to distrust my own ability,' and so on. And if, sometimes, the strain of the life tells even upon him, duty supplies the answer immediately. 'Some have also wished that the next way to their father's house were here, that they might be troubled no more with either hills or mountains to go over, but the way is the way, and there is an end.'

The Valley of Humiliation.

Before closing this section, we must revert for a moment to the 'Valley of Humiliation' with which

¹ D. G. Rossetti, *House of Life*, lxxxv.

it began. It has been supposed that this Valley was suggested by the very steep descent to Millbrook,¹ which lies a few miles to the south-west of Bedford, and with which Bunyan must have been familiar. It is only a mile or two distant from those Amphill Heights on which the supposed House Beautiful is built, and while under certain atmospheric conditions the descent appears exceedingly ominous and gloomy, it is a singularly beautiful place of lush green grass and thick woods. The point that is emphasized here is the difference between the appearance of the Valley to different people. While Christian had found it so dreadful a place, Mr. Fearing was happier there than at any other part of the journey. In any cross section of literature the same phenomenon may be found. James Thomson and Robert Browning will sing you songs of precisely the same experiences, and one will be an Ode of Triumph, and the other the dirge of the City of Dreadful Night. The obvious explanation is the difference between the mental and moral life of the writers.

But in Great-heart's discussion of the Valley of Humiliation we are brought down to still more minute detail in the analysis of character. Mr. Fearing takes humiliation gently and rejoices in lowliness, because of his gentle and unassuming nature. Christian is essentially a proud man. Accordingly, he is much blamed for those slips which he encountered in going down from the House Beautiful to the Valley. In the First Part the slips

¹ Cf. Foster, *Bunyan's Country*, chap. iv.

were quite casually mentioned, but now attention is entirely fixed upon them, and we are told that he would have found nothing too hard if it had not been for them. There is indeed an amusing little touch of what might almost be called rationalism in this connexion, where we are told that the reason for the hard name which this Valley has got is that 'the common people, when they hear that some frightful thing has befallen such an one, in such a place, are of opinion that that place is haunted with some foul fiend or evil spirit; when, alas! it is for the fruit of their doing that such things do befall them there.' The Valley of Humiliation is indeed a fat land, and fine in summer-time, but Christian is in the winter of his discontent, and carries his climate within, just as Mr. Fearing carried a Slough of Despond within him. Christian is that sort of man, and in this is very different from Hopeful as well as from Fearing. His pride, together with 'Forgetful Green,' explains the whole trouble. 'It is when they forget what favours they have received, and how unworthy they are of them, that pilgrims meet with Apollyon there.' For the mind free from pride, and making no great demand or claim for itself, the Valley is a wholly delightful place of luxury and rich gifts, free from the noise and hurrys of life, and full of the sound of singing. In this fact the new Christian grace of humility vindicates itself, and, bringing a peculiar blessedness, outwits the pagan joy of pride.

Contributions and Comments.

The Parable of the Mustard Seed.

HOLTZMANN, in his *Life of Jesus*, says of this parable: 'The Parable of the Mustard Seed was evidently handed down incorrectly from the first. The little mustard seed does not grow into a very large bush, nor is the mustard seed smaller than all the seeds of the earth. But the Parable of the Leaven shows clearly what the original version was. As leaven leavens a great quantity of flour, so the little mustard seed has a very sharp and pungent taste; in like manner, a short exhortation by a preacher may produce a powerful

revolution in the hearer.' Holtzmann thinks the motive for the alteration is to be found in the saying of the Lord in Mt 17²⁰ = Lk 7⁶, where the mustard seed is contrasted with a mountain or a mulberry tree (συκάμινος). As far as Western ideas are concerned, a nut or an apple-pip would have served the purpose of the figure equally well.

Bruce, in his *Parabolic Teachings of Christ*, alludes to the possibility of the parable being susceptible to the application of the individual, the mustard seed being made to represent the same thing as the leaven; that is, not the in-

significant company of Christ's disciples, but the faith through which they become disciples.

Loisy thinks it is perhaps the coming of the Kingdom, not the Christian community, that is compared to the extraordinary development of the mustard, and the drift of the parable is not to insist upon the rapid extension of Christianity, which would be an argument against its authenticity, but to remove the doubt of the fulfilment of the gospel in the Kingdom to which its humble beginnings would give rise. The differences in the phrasing of the several evangelists are due, Loisy thinks, to their different points of view. Matthew sees in the Sower Jesus in the field of the world, in the mustard seed the Christian community, in the birds the converts of all nations; Mark insists on the smallness of the seed, because he thinks of the precarious state of the Kingdom in the present; Luke is thinking of the spread of the gospel among the Gentiles.

If we adopt the speculations of Dr. Abbott, as set forth in his volume, *The Corrections of St. Mark*, and his view of the faith as a grain of mustard seed, the difficulties connected with the parable will be somewhat modified. It is unfortunate that his learning and subtlety are stowed away in volumes inaccessible to those who cannot purchase expensive books and have no knowledge of Hebrew. It is a pity, too, that Loisy's Commentary on the Synoptists, so bold, so detailed, so painstaking, should remain untranslated, and in its French form so expensive. These piteous facts are the excuse for this article.

Dr. Abbott, then, says (376 of his *Diatessarica*) the words 'which a man sowed' would be, in Hebrew, 'which a man sowed *it*.' This superfluous pronoun, in the sentence 'which a man sowed *it* on his land,' only needs a single letter (the change of *avro* to *avrov*) to become 'on *his* land,' which might be interpreted as (Mt.) 'his field,' or (Lk.) 'his garden.'

Dr. Plummer notes here the characteristic domestic tone of Luke displayed in 'his garden,' which may be taken as equivalent to Israel.

Omitting some passages from Abbott which are not quite relevant to our purpose, he surmises that the meaning of Mark is: 'It shoots up (*ἀναβαίνει*) from the ground and (afterwards) *becomes* greater than all the herbs.' Matthew says, 'When it *has grown up* it *is* greater than the herbs.' In § 380 Abbott says: 'First, as to

Mark's and Matthew's words, "greater than (all) the herbs," are we to suppose that Luke omitted them simply because they could be left out without detriment to the sense?' More probably there was some corruption or suspicion of corruption. The Hebrew words 'herbs' and 'green bough' are similar enough to be easily confused. And 'become greater than' resembles 'make great' or 'multiply.' Hence 'it becomes greater than the herbs' is easily confused with 'it maketh great, or multiplieth, its boughs.' But this, or nearly this, follows in Mark's next clause. Hence Luke might omit the 'herb clause,' or some form of it, as part of a conflation.

Again, the LXX affords instances where shady branches (R.V. 'lotus trees') and 'boughs' are rendered 'trees' or 'trunks.' On this analogy the Corrector might say that the meaning was not 'maketh great branches,' but 'maketh a great stem or trunk, like a tree'—a rendering adopted by Matthew and Luke. (The references are to Job 40^{21, 22}, Ezk 31^{12, 13}).

The parallelism between (Mk.) 'under its shadow' and (Matt. and Lk.) 'in its branches' may be illustrated by an instance of the Greek rendering of 'shadow' by 'branches' in Job 40^{21, 22}.

With regard to the 'Faith as a grain of mustard seed,' in his notes on Silanus (2851) Dr. Abbott quotes Origen (on Mt 17²⁰, *Lomm.* iii. 219) making 'faith as a grain of mustard seed' to signify its *small repute in the eyes of men*. Both here and later on (*Lomm.* iii. 323) Origen identifies it with Paul's '*all faith*,' and likens it to the fault of Abraham. He takes the meaning to be not that prayer is stronger than faith, but that 'all faith,' or 'faith in its entirety,' was needed and not possessed by the Apostles. On the other hand, Clem. Alex. *Theod.* Excerpt 993, says: 'The Saviour showed his faithful apostles that *prayer was stronger than faith* . . . saying, "Such (evils) as these are set right by prayer."'

These facts show (what is *a priori* probable) that the expression 'faith as a grain of mustard seed' caused difficulty in very early times. It would naturally be taken to mean 'a very little faith.' But Origen's conclusion seems right—though his arguments are not convincing—that it means 'a living faith.' It seems to have been paraphrased by Mark, both in 9²⁹ and in 11^{22, 23}, as 'faithful and fervent' prayer.

If this interpretation be accepted, it is an argument in favour of Holtzmann's interpretation of the mustard seed of the parable. In any case, Dr. Abbott's speculations tend to relieve the original source of the word 'tree,' which is the chief difficulty. For, as Bruce (who is always ready to face a difficulty frankly) says, 'The plant at its best is only a great herb; and it can be called a tree only by a latitude in the use of words.'

The same author combats without dogmatizing the view of Greswell, which is akin to that of Holtzmann and Abbott, namely, that 'faith as a grain of mustard seed' does not mean faith as 'small as a grain of mustard seed,' but faith as *vigorous* as its vital power. Similarly, in comparing the Kingdom to a grain of mustard seed, Jesus meant to say, 'The kingdom of heaven is now in appearance insignificant and impotent, but it has within it a Divine power, which will enable it to triumph over all hindrances, and make it ere long great and mighty.'

Against this Bruce sets the fact that in Palestine the smallness of the mustard seed was proverbial, but admits that it is possible that Christ's full thought was this: 'If ye had but faith even of the dimensions of a grain of mustard seed ye could work wonders, such is its power, even as the tiny seed has vital force sufficient to produce a plant reaching to the size of a tree.'

J. HUNTER SMITH.

Colwyn Bay.

The Children's Bread and the Dogs (Matt. xv. 21-28).

It is so startling at this time of day to have a theological dogma introduced to explain this difficulty, as is done by the Rev. G. E. Ford in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for April, that it may be permissible to refer to the explanation offered in vol. xiii. pp. 189-190, and also to point out that the supposed difficulty about 'dogs' does not exist, as the word used denotes, not the despised dogs of the streets, but the little household dogs which had a place in the home. Jesus wants her to look upon Him, not as a physician from a foreign land passing by out of sight and ken, but as one in whose circle she herself has a place. She sees—understands—that is faith.

F. WARBURTON LEWIS.

Aberystwyth.

Earthworms.

'IN the boundless north-west of Canada,' Mr. Morrison informs us, 'there is not a single earthworm. This interesting fact I was able to verify by personal observation during a year of residence on the prairie.' Mr. Morrison has not accurately sifted *all* the soil, otherwise he would certainly have found a considerable number of earthworms in many parts of Canada—a statement I can easily substantiate. However, my reply to him is, that while there are large tracts of North America where there are no earthworms *now*, it does not by any means follow that they were always absent from these regions. There are two theories with regard to their absence: One is that the earthworms did their work so well long ago that the soil is too rich in humic acid and the like to be tolerant of them now. The other, put forward by Beddard in his recent little book, is that 'it is equally conceivable that this part of the world lost its earthworm fauna through excessive glaciation in the ice age, the forms having been driven south, and are now only gradually making their way northwards again.'

J. THOMSON.

Carmyllie.

Matthew v. 20.

'EXCEPT your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees.'

The Greek word for 'righteousness' is *δικαιοσύνη*, which is the equivalent of the Hebrew צִדְקָה or צִדְקָה, and no doubt צִדְקָה, or its Aramaic equivalent צִדְקָתָא, was the word which Jesus actually used. In the time of Jesus, however, this word had largely lost its general meaning of 'righteousness,' and had become restricted to the action in which righteousness mainly manifests itself, namely, 'almsgiving,' or, in the concrete, 'alms.' This post-classical meaning of צִדְקָה was known to the LXX translators of Deuteronomy, that is, as early as the middle of the third century B.C., for they render it by *ἐλεημοσύνη* at 6²⁵ and 24¹³. In the Psalms *ἐλεημοσύνη* is always the equivalent of צִדְקָה—24 (23)⁵ 33 (32)⁵ 103 (102)⁶ as also in Is 1²⁷ 28¹⁷ 59¹⁶—or צִדְקָה—35 (34)²⁴. In Is 38¹⁸ it is the equivalent of אֱמֶת, 'truth,' as in Arabic is *ṣidq* (צִדְקָה). In Pr. it always stands for חֶסֶד, 'mercy,' as also in Gn 47²⁹. In Dn it answers to צִדְקָה—

⁴²⁷ (24)—which clearly means ‘almsgiving,’ or to צדקה—⁹¹⁶.

In the Mishna צדקה means ‘alms’ (Pirkê Abôth, v. 13). In Arabic one of the two words for ‘alms’ is the Hebrew צדקה transliterated, as it is also in Syriac: the other is probably the Aramaic זכות, ‘merit.’

Thus at the time of Jesus the Hebrew word צדקה had become narrowed in the scope of its

meaning, exactly as our word ‘charity’ has done; and it seems clear that the words of Mt 5²⁰ mean ‘Except your *alms* exceed those of the scribes and Pharisees’ (cf. Lk 11⁴¹ 12³³, Mk 12⁴⁴, Mt 19²¹). It is also possible that Jesus may here have followed a common practice of His and used the word in both its senses at once (cf. Mt 8²²).

T. H. WEIR.

University of Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

Dr. W. N. Clarke.

In the preface to his new book, *Why does not God Intervene?* Dr. Ballard pays an agreeable tribute to the work of the late Professor W. N. Clarke. After referring to Dr. Clarke’s latest volume on *The Christian Doctrine of God*, which he speaks of as ‘a work to which no greater praise can be accorded than to say that it is on a level with his former *Outline of Christian Theology*,’ he adds in a footnote, ‘With deepest regret I learn, as these pages are passing through the press, that this noble Christian teacher has passed from our human midst. If my poor words shall serve no other purpose than to direct others to the study of his invaluable works, as specified, I shall be sufficiently rewarded.’

A New Annual.

Annuals (in literature) are rare. To their small number must now be added *The Journal of the Manchester Oriental Society* (Manchester: At the University Press; 5s. net). It is an outcome of the scholarship and enthusiasm of the late Professor Hope W. Hogg, and five of the articles in the first number (1911) are from his pen. Fully half of the pages are occupied with discussions of the phrase ‘Heart and Reins.’ It is discussed by Mr. G. Elliot Smith and Mr. Alan H. Gardiner in relation to the Egyptian mummy; by Professor Hogg, Mr. M. A. Canney, and Mr. Abrahams in reference to its use in Hebrew and post-biblical Judaism; by Mr. King in relation to Babylonian divination; and by Bishop Casartelli and Professor Rhys Davids in regard to its use in Ancient Iran and in India. The annual ends with an apprecia-

tion of Professor Hogg, written in excellent taste by Professor Peake. There are some good illustrations.

A New Quarterly.

Its title is simply *Studies*. But it is further described as ‘An Irish Quarterly Review of Letters, Philosophy, and Science.’ It is published in Dublin by Messrs. M. H. Gill & Son (2s. 6d. net). The first number is dated ‘March 1912.’ In a ‘Foreword’ the editor tells us that the occasion of the appearance of a new quarterly review in Ireland is the new prospects for higher education opened up by recent legislation. In close co-operation with the professor’s chair will go the chair of the editor. The subjects to be covered by the Review are therefore all ordinary University subjects. They are here divided into (1) General Modern Literature; (2) Celtic, Classical, and Oriental Subjects and Historical Questions; (3) Philosophy, Sociology, and Education; (4) Sciences, experimental and observational.

Notice especially the place given to Celtic subjects. In the first number the first article is Celtic, defiantly Celtic. It is a poem on ‘The Theft of the Hounds of Finn.’

Recent Poetry.

Metred Playlets is the title which Mr. W. Winslow Hall, M.D., has given to his new book of poetry, which has been placed by Mr. Fifield in his ‘Grey Boards’ series. The contents are light comedies, very light, the first being called by the author a ‘farficle.’ The object is to let the foolish ones of modern society see themselves as others see them.

The Hill of Vision is the title which Mr. James Stephens has given to a volume of great variety both of subject and of accomplishment (Maunsel; 3s. 6d. net). On the page opposite to a ridiculous affair called 'The Girl I left Behind Me,' there is found this picture of the heart that knows its own bitterness.

SHAME.

I was ashamed, I dared not lift my eyes,
I could not bear to look upon the skies;
What I had done! sure, everybody knew!
From everywhere hands pointed where I stood,
And scornful eyes were piercing through and
through
The moody armour of my hardihood.

I heard their voices too, each word an asp
That buzz'd and stung me sudden as a flame:
And all the world was jolting on my name,
And now and then there came a wicked rasp
Of laughter, jarring me to deeper shame.

And then I looked, but there was no one nigh,
No eyes that stabbed like swords or glistened sly,
No laughter creaking on the silent air:
And then I found that I was all alone
Facing my soul, and next I was aware
That this mad mockery was all my own.

The Heart Hath Said. This is the title of a very thin volume of poems by the Rev. J. H. Newsham-Taylor, M.A. (Gay & Hancock; 1s. 6d. net). The themes are common, but there is an occasional unexpectedness in the turn of the thought. Take this:

THE GATES OF THE WEST.

The drifting horizon clouds that strain
On the ocean's breast,
Now gather like guards on a triumph-lane
Acclaiming their King who returns to reign,
When the great red sun rides home again
Through the Gates of the West!

So be my ending! Death's goal in sight,
Last steps caressed
By the sane dark clouds, that did once affright,
Now softly sustaining the lane of light,
When the warrior-soul shall pass one night
Through the Gates of the West!

Illustrations.

A volume is offered for the best illustration of any of the following texts in St. John's Gospel—
13¹⁰ 13³⁴ 14¹ 14² 14⁶ 14¹⁵⁻¹⁷ 14²³ 14²⁶ 14²⁷ 15¹ 15⁴
16⁷ 16⁸⁻¹¹ 16¹³ 16²³ 17³ 17¹⁵ 17¹⁹ 18^{37, 38} 20¹⁷
20^{19, 20} 20²³ 20²⁸ 20²⁹ 21¹⁵⁻¹⁷ 21²².

Also for the best illustration of any of the

following texts—James 1¹⁷ 5¹⁶, 1 Peter 1³ 1⁸ 1¹² 2⁵
2²¹ 2²⁴ 3¹⁵ 3¹⁸⁻²⁰ 5⁷, 2 Peter 1⁵⁻⁷ 3¹³ 3¹⁸, 1 John 1⁵ 1⁷
1^{8, 9} 2¹ 3¹ 3² 3³ 4⁷ 4⁸ 4¹⁶ 4¹⁸ 4¹⁹ 5⁴ 5²¹, Jude 20-21.

Those who are successful may choose two volumes from the 'Great Texts' or the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, or one volume from the 'International Critical Commentary' or the 'International Theological Library.' Ten volumes will be given in all.

The illustrations must be received by the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, by the end of July 1912.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. Donald Grigor, Congregational Manse, Walkerburn.

Illustrations for the Great Text for July must be received by the 1st of June. The text is Ro 1^{3, 4}.

The Great Text for August is 2 Ch 25²—'He did that which was right in the eyes of the Lord, but not with a perfect heart'; along with 2 Ch 31²¹—'He did it with all his heart, and prospered.' A copy of Dykes' *The Christian Minister and his Duties*, or of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for September is 1 Co 4⁵—'Wherefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who will both bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and make manifest the counsels of the hearts; and then shall each man have his praise from God.' A copy of Farnell's *Greece and Babylon*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for October is 1 Co 15⁵⁸—'Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye stedfast, unmoveable, always abounding in the work of the Lord, forasmuch as ye know that your labour is not vain in the Lord.' A copy of any volume of the 'Great Texts' or of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series will be given for the best illustration sent.

The Great Text for November is Ro 15¹³—'Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, in the power of the Holy Ghost.' A copy of Coats's *Types of English Piety*, or of Stone and Simpson's *Communion with God*, or of Lewis's *Philocalia of Origen*, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.